THE

SPEECH

OF

Nicholas Heath

Lord Chancellor of *England*,
Lord President of *Wales*,
Bishop of *Worcester*,

And afterward Archbishop of [illegible]
and Ambassadour into *Germany*, [illegible]
vered in the Upper House of Par[illegible]
ment, in the Year 1555. On occasion
of the *Supremacy*.

Proofs from Scripture.

That Christ left a True Church, and that there is
no Salvation but in the Catholick, *and* [illegible]
lick Church.

Proofs from the Fathers.

That there is no Salvation to be expected out of
the True Catholick *and* Apostolick Church.

Certain Principles of the first Authors of the [illegible]
tion, not so well known to many of their [illegible]

The Principles of the *Catholick Apostolick*

Testimony of the Fathers touching the Real P[illegible]

LONDON, Printed for the Au[illegible]

UI

TO THE READER.

I *Cannot but admire to see most* Protestants *so negligenn in their search of* Truth, *so seemingly secure, and so indifferent in the buying and reading* Controversial Books, *(which abound now a days more than ever) when yet in their* Hearts *they know they may be in* Errour, *for even by their* own Principles *they dare not so much as affirm they are* Certainly *in the right. The swarms of* Books *about* Religion, *that have these two last years fill'd the* Press, *render it impossible to say any thing* New *on this Occasion, and therefore farther indeavours to write* Controversy, *may seem vain and unnecessary; and*

indeed, if all the Catholick *Books that have been lately Publiſh'd, were read by the* Proteſtants, *with the ſame Spirit of Humility with which they were wrote, all prejudice, paſſion, and intereſt, laid aſide, there would be abundantly enough to open the eyes of the people, and ſatisfie all diſcerning* Men *that* Popery *is not that Antichriſtian Monſter which it has for ſo many years been painted in* England, *but that it is indeed the true Antient* Catholick *and* Apoſtolick Faith, *which our Saviour deliver'd and taught his Apoſtles, and which has continued ſince, and been believed in the Church, in all ſucceeding Ages. But ſince we find too many ſtop their ears againſt all the charms of Truth, ſince we find ſtill ſuch mighty numbers of Men continue in entertaining their old barbarous conceits of the* Catholick Religion,

ligion, *and either through malice or negligence, very slow in Reading what might Inform their judgements, and settle their Consciences, it cannot be esteemed improper for every honest Man to contribute his Mite, and endeavour what he may, to rouse up some by a third or fourth call, who have refused the first and second; and for as much as many are discouraged by the length, and some by the dearness of the Book: I have resolved to remove these two Impediments, an hours reading, with the expence of two pence, is all the time and the charge that needs be spent upon this Pamphlet.*

It must not be expected I should launch out into those prolix Disputes that have almost at this day tir'd the Pens of Schoolmen; I intend only to establish two or three most important Truths on which the Catholick Faith

does more immediately depend. What I may beside insist on, shall only be in general, so as to give the Reader an occasion of seeking elsewhere more particular Information, and that with as much brevity as I can, or the nature of the thing will admit.

I shall take the liberty to suppose (in as much as many Protestants own as much) that there has been in all Ages since our Saviour Christ planted the Gospel, a true Church on Earth, or to express my self more in the Protestant Phrase, that there has been in every Age since Christ, a company of Men who have retained that Orthodox Faith deliver'd in the Gospel: I dare not think there is a Protestant living will deny this, because he would by so doing first maintain there was an Age since Christ, where in all the Articles of the Creed were not true; viz. that

there

there was no Holy Catholick Church, *ſeconly, he would make Chriſt a falſe Prophet, who has declared* he would never depart from his Church, but that he would be with her even unto the end of the World, and that the Gates of Hell ſhould not prevail againſt her. *Matt.* 16. 18.

I will in the ſecond place make bold to ſuppoſe, that this true Church or this company of Orthodox Men has been viſible in all Ages: If there be a Proteſtant *in the World, ſo weak, as to imagine the true Church was not viſible in all Ages, I deſire him to conſider, that ſo much is implyed in the very nature and eſſence of a Church, as to Preach the* Goſpel *and adminiſter the* Sacraments, *(which even in his own notion are* Viſible Signs*) without which a* Church *can no more ſubſiſt than a* Man *with-*

out a Head, *or a* Houſe *without a* Foundation: *And Secondly, ſeeing Preaching the* Goſpel *and Adminiſtring the* Sacraments *are Actions, Viſible and Conſpicuous, the Church that does theſe things, muſt by neceſſary conſequence be* Viſible *and* Conſpicuous *likewiſe; there is no Sophiſtry in this, but what any one that pleaſes may reduce to a plain and eaſy Syllogiſm: And indeed, is there any thing in Nature more abſurd and contradictory, than to affirm the* true Church *was at all times, and yet not at all times* Viſible? *What the Church daily does, and what ſhe muſt of neceſſity do, to deſerve that name, are things as manifeſt and evident to humane ſenſe as teaching a* School, *or the Rule of a* Commonwealth; *and will any man affirm that a* School *can be Taught, or a* State Governed *in an* inviſible

Manner?

Manner? Surely no; neither then may any Proteſtant *be ſo abſurd, as to believe the Church of Chriſt was at any time Inviſible, and not rather Viſibly Apparent in her* Rites *and* Sacraments, *as well as in her* Aſſemblies *on thoſe occaſions.*

Taking it then for granted, that there has been a true Church *at all times ſince Chriſt; and that* this Church *has been at all times viſible, it follows by an eaſie Conſequenee, which every body can infer, that whatever Church is not able to prove her Being ſince Chriſt, and her being viſible all that time, cannot be the* True Church: *But neither the Church of* England, *nor that of* Luther *or* Calvin, *nor any* Proteſtant Reformed Church, *have been* Viſible *in all Ages ſince Chriſt, therefore, neither the Church of* England, *nor any other* Proteſtant *Church is the* True

Church.

Church. *I would fain see to this a plain and possitive answer given; 'tis what has not yet been given by any defender of the* Protestant Cause, *nor, I suppose, will ever be to the end of the World. How ridiculous is it, and how unbecoming any reasonable Creature what* Protestants *urge in this matter, that their Principles were taught and believed in the* Primitive Church, *till she fell into Idolatry and Superstition, where she lay buried for above* 1000 *years, till God rais'd up* Luther *and* Calvin, *and the other Reformers, to remove the Errors, and raise up a new Glorious Orthodox* Church. *I have often admir'd how such palpable Nonsence, and such gross Contradictions came to be proposed, but much more how they ever came to be receiv'd in the World! For what can be more ignorantly Blasphemous than to say God*

raised

raiſed up Men to reſtore his Church, *who yet could by no means Agree among themſelves in matters of Faith* (*as hereafter will appear*) *and whoſe Followers do at this day purſue each other with* Excommunications *and* Anathema's? *If* Calvin *was the Meſſenger of God, then was* Luther *a Sacrilegious Impoſtor; if the Church of* England *be* Orthodox, *then were* Luther *and* Calvin *both Impoſtors; and if any other of the* Reformers *were in the right, the Church of* England *is in the wrong. Which then of the Diſſenting* Proteſtants *Doctrin ſhall we ſay was the belief of the* Primitive *Church? Were all theſe at once the* Primitive Faith, *or was ſome one Denomination of Proteſtants, the* primitive Believers, *and thoſe of all* other Denominations *in the wrong It being impoſſible, as I have proved, that*

the

the True Faith *ſhould ever be* Inviſible *at any time; if therefore* Proteſtancy *had ever been profeſſed, it could never have been totally extinguiſh'd.*

Though moſt certain it is, that no footſteeps of any of the Reformers *Principles were known for almoſt* 1500 *years in the* Chriſtian World, *except in ſome* Hereſies *condemned in ſeveral Ages of the* Church, *which do indeed much reſemble the Innovations of our Modern* Reformers; *as their Doctrine of the* Sacrament, *in the Hereſie of* Berengarius; *of* Invocation *of* Saints, *in the Hereſie of* Vigilantius; *of* Prayer for the Dead *in* Aerius; *of* Images, *in* Xenias *and the* Iconaclaſts; *of* Confeſſion, *in the* Novatianus; *their practice of no* mingled Chalice, *in the Hereſie of the* Armenians; *and of* Prieſts Marriages, *in* Jovinian;

as

as Luthers *Marrying a* Nun, *borrowed from* Marcions *corrupting a Virgin, and to add no more; their Famous Naggshead* Conſecration *copied from* Novatus *that was made a Biſhop in a* Tavern, *and depoſed by* Cornelius.

And now for the Church *of* England, *ſhe muſt ever ſtand, or fall on her own Bottom, having ſo notoriouſly condemned all other parts of the* Reformation: *That the* Lutherans *are condemn'd by the* Church *of* England, *every body knows, and that the* Calviniſts *are ſo too, I will in one word plainly ſhew. A* Proteſtant *Parſon that comes from* France, *from* Holland *or* Geneva, *to be Beneficed in* England, *cannot be admitted to Preach, nor Adminiſter the Sacraments after the Rites of the* Engliſh Church, *till he has renounced that Miſſion he had*

had before, and taken new Orders according to the form of the Church of England, *which to all Men of ſenſe implies, that the* Church *of* England *does aſſuredly believe the* Calviniſt *Teachers are falſe Impoſters, that they have no* Miſſion, *no* Authority, *no* Ordination, *and by conſequence no* Sacraments, *being in their conceits purely* Lay-men: *From hence I take the liberty to ask the Doctors of the* Engliſh *Church, how they can in honour and conſcience call them their* Brethren (*as they do*) *of the* Reformation, *from whom they have ſeperated at ſo great a diſtance, as to reject all their* Ordinations *at once as* null *and* void, *and how they can ſuffer the* French *and* Dutch Hugonots *to have Churches, and free exerciſe of their Religion here, and ſome of them alſo the Church of* Englands Liturgy; *at*

the

the ſame time, as they believe them neither to have Prieſthood *nor* Sacraments, *and by conſequence no ſuch thing as a Church at all? Seeing then the Church of* England *look on themſelves as the* only *Church of the* Reformation; *it follows, that ſhe muſt accordingly prove her ſelf the* true *Church, and ſhew how that Sum of Chriſtian* Doctrin *which ſhe now holds, has been conſtantly held in all paſt Ages of the Church, which I am ſure all the* Engliſh *Doctors in the World will not make out; nay, I think they do not ſo much as pretend to. For to end all Controverſies, let them ſhew but one* Service-Book, *in all the* 1500 *years before* Luther, *in any one vulgar Tougue, which agreeth with their* Service Book, *and for that one Book ſake, we will ſubmit the cauſe; no, they ſay contrariwiſe, that for about* 1000 *years*

Popiſh

Popiſh Superſtition was the only Religion known in the World: Which Superſtition *(as they call it) I ſhall now endeavour to prove to be that* true Religion *which has been from our Saviours time, and which muſt Infallibly laſt to the end of the World.*

The Arguments by which I have briefly, and I hope evidently ſhewn that the Proteſtant Church *neither ſingle nor aggregate, can be the true* Church, *do at the ſame time as evidently prove the* Church *of* Rome *to be ſo. For as the* Proteſtant Churches *want of* Antiquity, *their not having been from the beginning of* Chriſtianity; *nor* Viſible *till within* 200 *years, proves them not to be the* Catholick Church, *ſo the Antiquity of the* Church *of* Rome, *her having been from the beginning, and continuing ſtill* Viſible

ſible by propagating the Goſpel, and Adminiſtring the Sacraments *in all Ages ſince* Chriſt, *does as plainly evince* her *to be the only true* Church, *the ſpouſe of* Chriſt *and Pillar of* Truth. *I demand, has not* this Church *in all Ages had a* viſible Succeſſion *of* Biſhops, *a* ſettled Government, *with a viſible* Head, *from St.* Peter *to this very day? Has not this been the* only Church *that has duly planted the Faith, and as duly ſuppreſſed* Hereſie *and* Schiſm? *Is not this the Church that has held all* General Councils, *and has not the Biſhop of* Rome *Preſided in the* four Firſt, *ſeemingly allowed of by the* Church *of* England? *Is not this the only Church that has ſent* Apoſtles *and* Miſſionaries *out to plant the* Goſpel *in all the* Infidel corners *of the Earth, and from whence* England *firſt re-*

ceived the Christian Faith? *Is there any other Church that can pretend to have been assisted by God Almighty in the working of* Miracles, *and in the Conversion of Nations? What other Church can shew an Army of* Martyrs *and* Confessors, *a number of Men that lead most Holy and Austere Lives, forsaking the World to follow Christ? What other Church in the World can pretend either to* Unity *or* Universality *to be every where the same,* and *to have all her Children at perfect Agreement in matters of* Faith *and* Doctrine? (*for the disputes of* Catholicks *are about matters* not defin'd, *and so* controvertable, *but never about a Doctrine that has been once determined in a* General Council) *These are the Marks and essential ones of the* true *Church, but these agree to no other Church but that of* Rome; *the Church of*

Rome

Rome *is therefore the only Church. Whatever the* Grecian *or the* Abyſſine *Churches have to ſay in anſwer to this,* (*which does not much concern us*) *ſure I am the* Church *of* England *has nothing plauſible to excuſe her Schiſm and Rebellion againſt her Mother* Church, *and under whoſe ſubjection ſhe has been bred and maintained for many Ages in the World. Every one knows,* (*and no* Church *of* England *Man can deny*) *that this National* Church *was in all Ages ſubject to, and a part of the* Weſtern *Church, and that the Biſhop of* Rome *is Patriarch, of the* Weſt *is acknowledged by King* James, *and* T. Biſhop *of* Wincheſter. *Now for a* part *to ſet up againſt the* whole, *for a* few Biſhops *of one* National *Church, to Reform the* Church *of all* Nations, *and for a* National Synod *to condemn all the*

General Councils *at once, is what all the Learning in the World can not justifie; I would fain know, why by the same reason, might not the Metropolitan of* York *Reform the National* Church *of* England, *if he should pretend gross intollerable errours; or the Diocesan of* Carlile *Reform the Metropolitan of* York *on the same score, and any single* Presbyter *again his Diocesan of* Carlisles, *which indeed happen'd in the fundamental Reformation, when* Luther *first Revolted, and though but a single Presbyter, yet took up on him boldly to Reform not only his own* Superiour *or* Diocesan, *but even no less than the* five Proto-Patriarchs *at once. The* Church *of Christ is surely an Established Government, with power sufficient to chastise her Rebellious Subjects; and certainly, our Saviour never meant that every*

Presbyter

Presbyter *ſhould be Independent, or that ever Biſhop ſhould be ſo, or that every Province ſhould be ſo, nor that any* Rational Church *ſhould be independent of the Whole. For our Saviour expreſſes himſelf clearly,* that all his Sheep ſhould be fed by one viſible Head, *that all the Chriſtians in the whole world ſhould be ſubject to one Law, and he gave ſufficient Authority for the putting of it in execution. If any* private Gentleman *here in* England *ſhould declare he found groſs intolerable Errours in the* Government, *that he abſolutely diſliked Monarchy, and ſhould ſtir up a Party in the Nation to a* Rebellion *againſt the King. Suppoſe a* Peer *ſhould do ſo, or ſuppoſe a Province, as for Inſtance, that of* Kent, *ſhould pretend to diſcover theſe Errours, and Revoult from their Sovereign, what*

think

think you? would not that Gentleman, *that* Peer, *or that* Province, *deservedly fall under the punishment of the Law, and be thought by all the World guilty of* Treason? *The Aplication is obvious, and I defie any Man living to shew the disparity, for the National Church of* England *was at least as much, and as unavoidably subject to the* Western Patriach *Church, as any one* Province *of* England, *to the Laws of the* whole Kingdom: *I never yet saw this objection answer'd, nor any plausible reason given for the Grounds and Motives of the* English Reformation: *And indeed the Schism is so obvious, the Defection so apparently inexcusable, and the Motives that induc'd* Henry *the* VIII. *and those that prevailed with* Edward *thee* VI. *and Q.* Eliz. *so notoriously scandalous, as* Blood, Divorce, Perjury, Sacriledge, *the maintainance of an* Usurped Title, *that it seemeth to me little less than a Miracle, how considering Men, who have regard to their Eternal wellfare, should be able to persuade themselves into a Belief, that they may safely venture in the Communion of a* Church, *sprung out of the* Ruins of Churches *and*

Reli-

Religious Houſes, *begun with the* Divorce *of Queen* Catherine, *reveled with the Blood of* Mary *Queen of* Scots, *made an Engine of ſtate to ſupport the Precatious Title of an* Uſurper, *and which has continued ever ſince in force by vertue of* Sanguinary Penal Laws. *This ſubject has given occaſion and vent to many Volumes, and I might eaſily have extended it to a far greater length, but I hope the Brevity will recommend it to the Peruſal of all thoſe who will not loſe themſelves, and the Queſtion in reading prolix Diſcourſes. I hope the old way of Anſwering will be no more taken up by Proteſtants to confute this or any Paper of the ſame Nature: For when they can find no Reaſons nor Arguments that may paſs with Diſcerning Men to juſtifie the defection of the* Engliſh *Church, or ſatisfie the people that the* Roman *is not the* Catholick Church, *they ſtill fly from the point in hand into Harangues and Rhetorical Digreſſions, falling foul on ſome Doctrine of the* Romiſh Church, *which they endeavour with* Tropes *and* figures *to paint out in the colours of Idolatry and Superſtition. Thus, when hard preſſed with*

the

the Sin of Schism, and not able to justifie their Seperation, they fall a railing at Transubstantiation, Purgatory, *&c. I would caution every Man that searches after Truth not to be put of with this Sophistry; If the* English Church *can not shew Persuasive Arguments for her deserting her Mother the Church of* Rome, *she fails in what is expected from her; 'Tis enough to fall foul on particular Doctrines, she ought to shew that no subjection was due from her to the* Western Patriarchal Church. *In treating of particular Controversies, as* Purgatory, *&c. the* Roman *Church is very well able to satisfie all reasonable and impartial Men, but she knows 'tis the trick of* Protestant *Writers to wheedle Men into the Labyrinth of Controversial points, and then dazle their eyes with fine words and elaborate Expressions.*

I will Inſert a Speech, made in Parliament, againſt *Supreme Eccleſiaſtical*, and *Spiritual Authority*, granted to Queen *Elizabeth*. The Perſon that ſpake it, was *Nicholas Heath*; who was firſt Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and Lord Preſident of *Wales*: Afterwards Arch-biſhop of *York*, and Embaſſador into *Germany*: And made Lord Chancellor of *England*, by Queen *Mary*, in the year of our Lord 1555; and continued, until he did ſurrender it up, in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, to Sir *Nicholas Bacon*.

The Perſon, from whom I had this Speech, is yet living; who told me, That he found it in *Manuſcript*, amongſt Papers and Notes of his great Grandfather, *George Parrey*, who had been High Sheriff of *Herefordſhire*, in the ſecond year of the ſaid *Queen*.

A Speech *Made in the Upper Houſe of Parliament, againſt the Supemacy to be in Her Majeſty; by* Nicholas Heath, *Lord Chancellour of* England, *in the firſt year of the Reign of Queen* Elizabeth, *above an* 100 *years ſince.*

In the Original Copy it is ſtiled,
A Tale told in Parliament.

For Oaths the Land ſhall be Cloathed in Mourning.

My LORDS,

With all humble ſubmiſſion of my whole Diſcourſe to your Wiſdoms, I purpoſe to ſpeak to the Body of this *Act*, touching the *Supremacy*; that

ſo, what this Honourable Aſſembly is now adoing, concerning the paſſing of this *Act*, may thereby be better weighed, and conſidered by your Wiſdoms.

Firſt, When by the Virtue of this *Act* of *Supremacy*, we muſt forſake and fly from the See of *Rome*, it would be conſidered, what matter lies therein; and what matter of danger, or inconvenience; or elſe, whether there be none at all.

Secondly, If the intent of this *Act* be to grant, or ſettle upon the *Queens* Majeſty a *Supremacy*; it would be conſidered of your Wiſdoms, what this *Supremacy* is, and whether it doth conſiſt in *Spiritual* Government, or *Temporal*?

If in *Temporal*; what further Authority can this Houſe give Her, more than what She already hath by right of Inheritance? And not by your Gift, but by the Appointment of God: Being our Sovereign *Lord* and Lady; our *King*, and Queen; our *Empreſs*, and Emperour: And if further than this, we acknowledge Her to be *Head* of the *Church of England*, we ought alſo to grant, that the Emperour, or any other Prince, being Catholick, and their Subjects Proteſtants, *are to be Heads of their Church:* Whereby we ſhall do an Act, as diſagreeble to the *Proteſtants*, as this ſeems to *Catholicks*.

If you ſay, The *Supremacy* conſiſts in *Spiritual* concernments.

Then

Then, it would be conſidered, what the *Spiritual Government* is? and in what points it doth chiefly conſiſt: Which being firſt agreed upon, it would be further conſidered of your Wiſdoms, whether this Houſe may grant it to her Highneſs, or not? And whether her Highneſs be an apt Perſon to receive the ſame?

So by through Examination of theſe parts, your Honours ſhall proceed in this matter groundedly, upon ſuch ſure knowledge, as not to be deceived by ignorance.

Now to the Firſt Point, wherein I promiſed to examine, what matter of weight, danger, or inconvenience might be incurred, by this our forſaking, and flying from the Church of *Rome*, if there were no further matter therein, than the with drawing our Obedience from the *Popes Perſon*, (ſuppoſing, that he had declar'd himſelf to be a very Auſtere and Severe Father to us) then the buſineſs were not of ſo great importance, as indeed it is, as will immediately here appear.

'For, by relinquiſhing and forſaking the 'Church, or See of *Rome*, we muſt forſake 'and fly from all General Councils.

'Secondly, from all Canonical and Eccleſi-'aſtical Laws of the Church of Chriſt.

'Thirdly, From the Judgement of all other 'Chriſtian Princes.

'Fourthly, and Laſtly, we muſt forſake 'and fly from the Holy Unity of Chriſt's

'Church; and so by leaping out of *Peter's* 'Ship, we hazard our selves to be over-'whelmed in the waves of Schism, of Sects, 'and Divisions.

First, Touching the General Councils, I shall name unto you these Four: The *Nicene* Council, the *Constantinopolitan* Council, the *Ephesine*, and the *Chalcedon*: All which are approved by all Men.

Of these same Councils, *Saint Gregory* writes in this wise; *Sicut enim Sancti Evangelii quatuor Libros, sic hæc quatuor Concilia*, Nicenum, Constantinopolitanum, Ephesium, & Chalcedonense, *suscipire, ac venerari me fateor*: That is to say in English, 'I confess, I do receive, and reverence 'those Four General Councils, of *Nice*, '*Constantinople, &c.* even as I do the Four 'Holy Evangelists.

At the *Nicene* Council, the first of the Four, the Bishops which were there Assembled, did write there Epistles to *Sylvester*, then Bishop of *Rome*, 'That their decrees 'then made, might be confirmed by his 'Authority.

At the Council kept at *Constantinople*, all the Bishops there, were obedient to *Damasus*, then Bishop of *Rome*: He, as chief in the Council, gave Sentence against the Hereticks, *Macedonius*, *Sabellius*, and *Eunomius*: Which *Eunomius* was both an *Arrian*, and the first Author of that Heresie, *That only Faith doth justifie.* And here (by the way)

it

it is much to be lamented, that we, the Inhabitants of this Realm are much more inclined to raiſe up the Errors and Sects of Ancient condemned Hereticks, than to follow the True Approved Doctrine of the moſt Catholick and Learned Fathers of Chriſt's Church.

At the *Epheſine* Council, *Neſtorius* the Heretick was condemned by *Celeſtine* the Biſhop of *Rome*, he being chief Judge there.

At the *Chalcedon* Council, all the Biſhops there Aſſembled, did write their humble Submiſſion unto *Leo*, then Biſhop of *Rome*; wherein they did acknowledge him there to be their *Chief Head*: Six Hundred and Thirty Biſhops of them.

Therefore to deny the See Apoſtolick, and its Authority, were to contemn and ſet at nought the Authority and Decrees of thoſe noble Councils.

Secondly, We muſt forſake and fly from all Canonical and Eccleſiaſtical Laws of Chriſt his Church; whereunto we have already profeſſed our Obedience at *the Font*, ſaying *Credo Sanctum Eccleſiam Catholicam*; that is, *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church*: Which Article contains, That we muſt receive the Doctrine, and Sacraments of the ſame Church, obey her Laws, and live according to the ſame: Which Laws do depend wholly upon the Authority of the *See Apoſtolick*. And like as it is there openly profeſſed by the Judges of the Realm, that

the Laws agreed upon in the Higher and Lower Houſes of this Honourable Parliament, be of ſmall, or none effect, before the Royal Aſſent of the King, or Prince be given thereunto: Even ſo Eccleſiaſtical Laws made, cannot bind the Univerſal Church of Chriſt, without the Royal Aſſent, and Confirmation of the *See Apoſtolick*.

Thirdly, We muſt forſake and fly from the Judgement of all other Chriſtian Princes, whether they be Proteſtant or Catholick Chriſtians, when none of them do agree with theſe our doings: King *Henry* the VIII. being the firſt that ever took upon him the Title of *Supremacy*.

And whereas it was of late, here in this Houſe, ſaid, by a Nobleman, That the Title of *Supremacy*, is of right due to a King, for that he is a King; then would it follow, That *Herod* being a King, ſhould be Supream Head of the Church at *Jeruſalem*: And *Nero* the Emperour, Supream Head of the Church of Chriſt at *Rome*; they being both Infidels, and therefore no members of Chriſt's Church.

And if our Saviour Chriſt, at his departure from this World, ſhould have left the *Spiritual* Government of his Church in the hands of Emperours, and Kings, and not to have committed the ſame to his Apoſtles, how negligently then ſhould he have left his Church!

It ſhall appear right-well, by calling to mind, That the Emperour *Conſtantinus Magnus* was the Firſt *Chriſtian Emperour*, and was Baptized by *Sylveſter*, Biſhop of *Rome*, about Three hundred years after the *Aſcenſion* of *Chriſt Jeſus*.

If by your Propoſition, *Conſtantine*, the firſt Chriſtian Emperor was the *Firſt Head*, and *Spiritual Governor* of Chriſts-Church, throughout his Empire; then it follows, That our Saviour Chriſt, for the ſpace of Three Hundred years, unto the coming of this *Conſtantine*, left his Church (which he had ſo dearly bought by effuſion of his moſt precious Blood) without any Head at all.

But how untrue the ſaying of this Nobleman was, it ſhall further appear by the Example of *Ozia*, and alſo of King *David*. For King *Ozia*, did take the *Cenſor* to do Incenſe to the Altar of God. The Prieſt *Azarius* did reſiſt him, and expelled him out of the Temple, and ſaid unto him. *Non eſt Officii tui*, Ozia, *ut adoleas Incenſum Domino*; *ſed eſt Sacerdotam, & Filiorum* Aaron: *Ad hujuſmodi enim Officium conſecrati.* That is to ſay, 'It is not thy Office, *Ozia*, to offer 'Incenſe to the Altar of God. But it is the 'Prieſts Office, and the Sons of *Aaron*; for 'they are Conſecrated, and Anointed to 'that Office.

Now I ſhall moſt humbly demand this queſtion; When the Prieſt *Azarius* ſaid to the King, *Non eſt Officii tui*; whether he

ſaid Truth, or not? If you anſwer, that he ſpake the Truth, then the King was not Supream Head of the Church of the *Jews*. If you ſhall ſay, No: Why did God plague the King with Leproſie, and not the Prieſt?

The Prieſt, *Azarias*, in reſiſting the King, and thruſting him out of the Temple; in ſo doing, did the Prieſt play the faithful part of a Subject, or no? if you anſwer No; why then did God ſpare the Prieſt, and not ſpare the King? If you anſwer, Yea; then it is moſt manifeſt, *Ozia*, in that he was a King, could not be Supream Head of the Church.

And therefore King *David* did go before the Ark of God with his Harp, making Melody; and placed himſelf amongſt the Minſtrels, and humbly did abaſe himſelf, (being a King) as to dance and leap before the Ark of God; like as his other Subjects did: Inſomuch, as his Queen *Michol*, King *Saul's* Daughter, beholding and ſeeing this great Humility of King *David*, did diſdain thereat. Whereunto King *David*, making anſwer, ſaid *Ludàm, & vilior fiam plùs quàm factus ſum, &c.* That is, 'I will dance, and 'abaſe my ſelf, more than yet I have done; 'and abjecting my ſelf in mine own eyes, I 'ſhall appear more glorious with thoſe 'Handmaids, that you talk of I will play 'here before my Lord; which hath choſen 'me, rather than thy Fathers Houſe. And whereas, Queen *Michol* was therefore

plagued

plagued at God's hand, with perpetual Sterility and Barrenneſs, King *David* received a great praiſe for his Humility.

Now may it pleaſe your Honours, to conſider which of both theſe Kings Examples ſhall be moſt convenient for your Wiſdoms, to make the Queens Majeſty to follow; whether the Example of Proud *Ozia*; moving Her, by your perſwaſions and Councils, to take upon her Spiritual Government; and thereby expoſing her Soul to be plagued at the hand of God, as King *Ozia* was: or elſe to follow the Example of the good King *David*, which, in refuſal of all Spiritual Government about the Ark of God, did humble himſelf, as I have declared unto you.

Whereunto our Sovereign Lady, the *Queens* Highneſs, of Her own nature being well inclined; we may aſſure our ſelves, to have of Her as Humble, as Virtuous, and as Godly a Miſtreſs to Reign over us, as ever had *Engliſh* People here in this Realm; if that her Highneſs be not by your Flattery, and Diſſimulation, ſeduced and beguiled.

Fourthly, and Laſtly, We muſt forſake, and fly from the Holy Unity of Chriſt's Church. Seeing that St. *Cyprian*, that Holy Martyr, and great Clerk, doth ſay, that the Unity of the Church of Chriſt doth depend upon *Peter's Authority*, and his Succeſſors. Therefore by leaping out of *Peter's* Ship, we muſt be overwhelmed with the

Waves,

Waves of Schiſms, of Sects and Diviſions: Becauſe the ſame Holy Martyr in his Third Epiſtle to *Cornelius* teſtifies, *That all Hereſies, Sects, and Schiſms, do ſpring only from hence, that Men will not be obedient to the Head Biſhop of God.*

And how true this ſaying of St. *Cyprian* is, we may ſee it moſt apparent to all Men that liſt to ſee, both by the Example of the *Germans*, and by us, the Inhabitants of this Realm of *England.*

And by this our forſaking, and flying from the Unity of the Church of *Rome*, this inconveniency amongſt many, we muſt grant the Church of *Rome* to be the True Church of God, where Jeſus Chriſt is truly taught, and his Sacraments rightly Adminiſtred; how can we disburthen our ſelves of our forſaking, and flying from that Church, which we do confeſs, and acknowledge to be of God, we ought to be *One*, and not to admit of any *Separation.*

If you Anſwer, the Church of *Rome* is not of God, but a Malignant Church; then it will follow, that we the Inhabitants of this Realm have not as yet received any Benefit of Chriſt; ſeeing we have received no Goſpel, or other Doctrine, nor no other Sacrament, but that which was ſent unto us from he Church of *Rome.*

Firſt, in King *Lucius* his days, at whoſe humble Epiſtle the Holy Martyr *Elutherius*, then Biſhop of *Rome*, did ſend into this Realm

Realm two Holy Monks, *Fugatius*, and *Damianus*; by whose Doctrine and Preaching, we were first brought to the knowledge of the Faith of Jesus Christ, of his Holy Gospel, and his most Holy Sacraments.

Then Secondly, Holy St. *Gregory* being Bishop of *Rome*, did send into this Realm two other Holy Monks, St. *Austin*, called the Apostle of *England*, and *Milletus*, to receive the very self same Faith that had been before planted here in this Realm, in the days of King *Lucius*.

Thirdly, and Last of all, *Paulus Tertius* being Bishop of *Rome*, did send hither the Lord Cardinal *Pool* his Grace, (by Birth a Nobleman of this Land) his Legate, to restore us unto the same Faith which the Martyr, St. *Eleutherius* and St. *Gregory* had Planted here many years before.

If therefore the Church of *Rome* be not of God, but a false and Malignant Church, then have we been deceived all this while; seeing the Gospel, the Doctrine, Faith, and Sacraments, must be of the same nature as that Church is, from whence it, and they came; and therefore in relinquishing, and forsaking that Church, the Inhabitants of this Realm shall be forced to seek further for another Gospel of Christ, other Doctrine, other Faith and Sacraments than we have hitherto received: Which will breed such a Schism, and Error in Faith, as was never in any Christian Realm. And therefore of

your

your Wiſdoms worthy of Conſideration, and maturely to be ponder'd, and be provided for, before you paſs this Act of *Supremacy*. Thus much touching the Firſt chief Point.

Now to the Second Deliberation, wherein I promiſed to move your Honours, to conſider, What this *Supremacy* is, which we go about, by vertue of this Act, to give unto the *Queen*, and wherein it doth conſiſt; whether in *Spiritual* Government, or *Temporal*. But if *Spiritual*, (as theſe words in the Act do import, *Supream Head of the Church of England, immediately and next unto God*;) Then it would be conſidered, in what Points this *Spiritual* Government doth conſiſt? and the Points being well known, it would be conſidered, Whether this Houſe hath *Authority* to grant them, and her Highneſs *Ability* to receive them.

And as concerning the Points, *wherein Spiritual Government doth conſiſt*, I have, in reading the Goſpel, and the whole courſe of Divinity thereupon (as to my Vocation belongeth) obſerved theſe Four, as chief among many others: whereof the firſt is, The power to looſe and bind ſins. When our Saviour, in ordaining *Peter* to be Chief, and Head-Governour of his Church, ſaid unto him, *Tibi dabo Claves Regni Cœlorum, &c.* That is, *To thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, &c. Now it would be conſidered by your Wiſdoms, whether

you

you have ſufficient Authority to grant unto her Majeſty this firſt Point of *Spiritual* Government; and to ſay unto Her, *Tibi dabimus, &c.* To *Thee will we give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* If you ſay Yea; then do we require the ſight of Warrant and Commiſſion, by the Virtue of God's Word. And if you ſay No: then you may be well aſſured, and perſuade your ſelves, that you have not ſufficient Authority to make her Highneſs *Supream Head of the Church of Chriſt* here in this Realm.

The Second Point of *Spiritual Government* is gathered out of theſe words of our Saviour Chriſt, ſpoken to *St. Peter* in the 20*th.* Chapter of *St. John's* Goſpel, *Paſce,——& Paſce——& Paſce,* That is, *Feed my Lambs, feed my Lambs, feed my Sheep*: Now, whether your Honours have Authority by this Court of Parliament, to ſay unto our *Sovereign Lady, Paſce, & Paſce, &c.* That is to ſay, *Feed you the flock of Chriſt*, you muſt ſhew your Warrant and Commiſſion for it. And further it is evident, that Her Majeſty, being a Woman by Birth and Nature, is not qualified by Gods word, to feed the Flock of Chriſt, appears moſt plainly by *St. Paul*, in this wiſe, *Taceant Mulieres in Eccleſiis, ſicut & lex dicit. Let Women be ſilent in the Church*; for *it is not Lawful for them to ſpeak*, but *to be in ſubjection*, as *the Law ſaith.* And it followeth in the ſame place. *Turpe eſt enim, Mulieris loqui in Eccleſiâ*, that is, for

that,

that it is not ſeemly for a Woman to ſpeak in the Church. And in his Second Epiſtle to *Timothy*, *Dominari in virum, ſed eſſe ſilentes*; that is to ſay, I allow not that a Woman be a Teacher, or to be above her Husband, but to keep her ſelf in ſilence. Therefore it appears likewiſe, as your Honours have not Authority to give her Highneſs this ſecond Point of *Spiritual* Government, to feed the Flock of Chriſt: So by St. *Pauls* Doctrine, her Higneſs may not intermeddle her ſelf with the ſame. And therefore She cannot be *Supream Head of the Church*, *here* in *England*.

The Third chief Point of *Spiritual* Government is gathered out of thoſe words of our Saviour Chriſt, ſpoken to *St. Peter* in the *22th.* Chapter of *St. Lukes* Goſpel, *Ego rogavi pro Te, ut non deficiat fides Tua*; *& Tu aliquando converſus, confirma fratres Tuos.* That is, *I Prayed for Thee, that thy Faith ſhall not fail*; *and thou being converted, Confirm thy Brethren*, and ratifie them in wholeſome Doctrine, and Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, which are the Holy Inſtruments of God ſo Inſtituted and Ordained for our Sanctification; that without them his Grace is not to be received. But to Preach, or to adminiſter the Sacraments, a Woman may not be admitted to do; neither may ſhe be *Supream* of *Chriſt*'s Church.

The Fourth and Laſt chief point of *Spiritual Government*, which I promiſed to Note

unto

unto you, doth consist in *Excommunication*, and *Spiritual Punishment* of all such, as shall approve themselves, not to be the Obedient Children of Christ's Church.

Of which Authority our Saviour Christ speaks in St. *Matthew's* Gospel, in the 18*th.* Chapter, saying, 'If your Brother offending 'will not hear your charitable admonition, 'whether secretly at first, or yet before one, 'or two Witnesses, then we must complain 'of him to the Church, and *If he will not hear the Church, let him be taken as an Heathen or Publican.*

So the Apostle did *Excommunicate* the notorious *Fornicator*, that was amongst the *Corinthians*; and by the Authority of his Apostleship; unto which Apostles, Christ Ascending into Heaven, did leave the whole *Spiritual* Government of his Church, as it appears by those plain words of St. *Paul*, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, Chap. 4*th.* saying, *Ipse dedit Ecclesiæ suæ*, &c. *He hath given to his Church, some to be Apostles, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Doctors, for consummation of the Saints, to the work of the Ministry, for edifying of the Body of Christ.* But a Woman in the degrees of the Church, is not called to be an Apostle, nor Evangelist; nor to be a Pastor (as much to say, a Shepheard) nor a Doctor, or a Preacher. Therefore she cannot be *Supream Head* of *Christ's Militant* Church; nor yet of any part thereof. For this high Government,

God

God hath appointed only to the Biſhops, and Paſtors of his People; as St. *Paul* plainly witneſſeth in theſe words, in the 20*th*. Chapter of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, ſaying, *Attendite vobis, & univerſo gregi, &c.* And thus much I have here ſaid, right Honourable, and my very good Lords, againſt this Act of *Supremacy*, for the diſcharge of my poor Conſcience, and for the Love, and Fear, and Dread, that I chiefly owe unto God, to my Sovereign Lord and Lady the Queens Majeſties Highneſs, and to your Honors All. Where otherwiſe, without mature conſideration of all theſe Premiſes, your Honors ſhall never be able to ſhew your faces before your enemies, in this matter; being ſo ſtrange a ſpectacle and example in Chriſt's Church, as in this Realm is only to be found, and in no other Chriſtan Realm.

Thus humbly beſeeching your Honors, to take in good part, this my rude and plain *Speech*, which here I have uſed, out of much Zeal and fervent good will: And now I ſhall not trouble your *Honors* any longer. *Thus as to this Speech.*

But notwithſtanding this *Speech*, or whatever elſe could be ſaid againſt it, the Act paſſed, and this Supremacy was granted to the Queen.

A further Proſecution of the Settlement of this Change of Religion Eſtabliſhed by Parliament, and of the Oppoſition of the *Catholick Clergy* againſt this ſtrange Innovation

By which my dear Country-men may ſee, as is prov'd by their own Hiſtories, how you are ſeduced into Erronious Religions, endangering thereby no leſs than their Salvation.

Dr. *Heylyn*, pag. 108.

NOw for the better exerciſing, and enjoying the Juriſdiction thus acknowledged in the Crown, there was this Clauſe put into the Act, *That it ſhould be Lawful for the Queen to give Power, to ſuch as ſhe thought fit, to exerciſe all manner of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, and to viſit, reform, redreſs, order, correct and amend all kind of Errors, Hereſies, Schiſms*, &c. *With this* Proviſo *notwithſtanding, that nothing ſhould from henceforth be accounted* Hereſie, *but what was ſo adjudged in the Holy Scripture, or in one of the four*

 firſt

four General Councils, or in any other National, or Provincial Council, determining according to the word of God; or finally, which ſhould be adjudg'd for the time to come, by the Court of Parliament

This was the firſt Foundation of the *High-Commiſſion Court*: And from hence iſſued that Commiſſion, by which the Queens miniſters proceeded in that viſitation, in the firſt year of her Reign, for rectifying all ſuch things as they found amiſs.

There alſo paſs'd another Act, for recommending and impoſing the Book of *Common-Prayer*, and Adminiſtration of Sacraments, according to ſuch Alterations, and Corrections as were made therein, by thoſe that were appointed to review it. In performance of which ſervice, there was great care taken to expunge out of all ſuch paſſages in it, as might give an Scandal or Offence to the *Papiſts*; or be urg'd by them, in excuſe for their not coming to Church.

In the *Litany* firſt made and publiſhed by King *Henry* the Eighth, and afterwards continued in the two *Liturgies* of King *Edward* the ſixth, there was a Prayer to be deliver'd from the *Tyranny, and all the deteſtable enormities of the Biſhop of* Rome: which was thought fit to be left out, as giving matter of Scandal and diſſatisfaction to all that Party.

In the firſt *Liturgy* of King *Edward*, the Sacrament of our *Lord's Body* was deliver'd with

with this *Benediction*, that is to ſay, *The Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which was given for the Preſervation of thy Body and Soul to Life Everlaſting. The Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. Which being thought by *Calvin*, and his Diſciples, to give ſome countenance to the Carnal preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament (which paſs'd by the name of *Tranſubſtantiation* in the Schools of *Rome*) was altered into this Form into the ſecond Liturgy; that is to ſay, *Take and Eat this in remembrance that Chriſt died for thee, and feed on him in thy Heart by Faith, with Thanksgiving take and drink this*, &c.

But the Reviſors of the Book, joyn'd both Forms together, leſt under colour of rejecting a *Carnal* they might be thought alſo to deny a *real preſence*, as was defended in the Writings of the Antient Fathers. Upon which ground they expunged alſo a *whole Rubrick* at the end of the *Communion Service*: By which it was declar'd, *That kneeling at the Communion, was required for no other reaſon, than for a ſignification of the humble and grateful acknowledgement of the Benefits of Chriſt, given therein unto the worthy Receiver, and to avoid that Prophanation, and Diſorder, which otherwiſe might have enſued: And not for giving any Adoration to the Sacramental Bread and Wine, there bodily receiv'd; or in regard of any Real or Eſſential Preſence of Chriſt's Body and Blood.* (This *Rubrick* is again lately inſerted.)

And to come up closer to those of the Church of *Rome*, it was order'd by the Queens Injunctions, That the Sacramental Bread (which the Book requir'd only to be made of the finest Flower) should be made round, in the fashion of the Wafers, used in the time of Queen *Mary*.

She also Order'd, that the *Lord's Table* should be placed where the Altar stood; and that the accustom'd Reverence should be made *at the Name of Jesus*: Musick retain'd in the Church, and all the other Festivals observ'd with their several Eves.

By which compliances, and the expunging of the passages before mentioned, the Book was made more plausible: And that it might pass the better in both Houses, when it came to the Vote, it was thought requisite, That a Disputation should be held about some Points, which were most likely to be keked at.

Two Speeches were made against this Book in the House of Peers, by *Scot* and *Feckenham*; and one against the Queens Supremacy, by the Archbishop of *York*: But they prevail'd little in both Points by the Power of their Eloquence.

In the Convocation, which accompanied this present Parliament, there was little done; because they despaired of doing any good to Themselves or their Cause.

The chief thing they did, was a Declaration of their Judgments in some certain Points

Points: Which at that time were conceiv'd fit to be commended to the ſight of the Parliament; that is to ſay,

Firſt, That the Sacrament of the Altar, by vertue of Chriſt's Aſſiſtance, after the words of Conſecration are duly pronounced by the Prieſt, the Natural Body of Chriſt, conceiv'd of the Virgin *Mary*, is *really preſent* under the *ſpecies* of Bread and Wine. As alſo his Natural Blood.

Secondly, That after the Conſecration, there remains not the Subſtance of Bread and Wine; nor any Subſtance, but the Subſtance of God and Man.

Thirdly, That the true Body of Chriſt, and his Blood, is offer'd for a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick, and Dead.

Fourthly, That the Supream Power of Feeding, and Governing the Militant Church of Chriſt, and of Confirming their Brethren, is given to *Peter* the Apoſtle, and to his lawful Succeſſors in the See Apoſtolick, as unto the Vicar of Chriſt.

Fifthly, That the Authority to handle and define ſuch things, as belong to Faith, the Sacraments, and Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, hath hitherto ever belonged, and only ought to belong unto the Paſtors of the Church, whom the Holy Spirit hath placed in the Church; and not unto Lay-men.

Theſe Articles they cauſed to be Engroſſed; and ſo commended them to the Care and Conſideration of the Higher Houſe;

preſented by *Boner*, to the Hands of the Lord Keeper *Bacon*; by whom they were candidly receiv'd.

But they prevail'd no further with the Queen, or Houſe of Peers, when imparted to them, than that (poſſibly) they might help forwards the afore-mention'd Diſputation.

It was on the four and twentieth of *June*, that the Publick Liturgy was to be officiated in all the Churches of the Kingdom. In the performance of which ſervice, the Biſhops giving no encouragement, and many of the Clergy being backward in it, it was thought fit to put them to a Final *Teſt*; and either to bring them to Conformity, or to beſtow their Places and Preferments, on more tractable Perſons.

The Biſhops at that time, were reduced into a narrow number, than at any other time before; there being no more than fifteen of that ſacred Order left.

Theſe, being call'd by certain of the Lords of the Council, were requir'd to take the Oath of *Supremacy*. *Kitchen*, of *Landaff*, only takes it: Who having formerly ſubmitted to every Change, reſolv'd to ſhew himſelf no *Changling*, in not conforming to the pleaſures of the Higher Powers.

By all the reſt it was refus'd.

Whereupon they were depriv'd of their Biſhopricks. The Biſhops being thus put out, the Oath is tendred next to the Deans, and

and Chapters; and laſtly to the rural Clergy, *Thus Dr.* Heylyn.

It is here to be noted, That during the fore-mentioned *Convocation*, there came from both the Univerſities, a Writing ſign'd by a publick Notary; by which they both ſignified their concurrence to the aforeſaid Articles, only with a little alteration of the laſt.

But theſe Declarations, and Proteſtations of the whole Repreſentative *Clergy*, and *Univerſities*, were not like to ſignifie much; ſince a Change of Religion was abſolutely reſolv'd on.

An account of the Years, in which theſe Changes in Religion were made.

IN her Firſt year, ſhe being reſolv'd upon an Alteration of Religion (as knowing well, that her Legitimation, and the *Pope's* Supremacy, could not ſtand together) called a Parliament, which totally complied with her Deſigns, in order to ſuch a Change. But the Convocation of the Clergy, which accompanied this Parliament, totally oppos'd it: And thereupon were depriv'd of their Eccleſiaſtical Benefices; a company of Ignorant and Illiterate Men, being Subſtituted in their places: Which gave occaſion to the *Calviniſts*, or *Presbyterians*, to obtain great Eccleſiaſtical Preferments here: By which

which they have continually laboured to ſupplant and undermine the Church of *England*.

It was the Second year of her Reign, before any *Proteſtant* Biſhops were elected. The main cauſe, for keeping the Epiſcopal Sees ſo long vacant, was, that in the mean time, the beſt Flowers might be culled out of them. Aid this year was ſent to aſſiſt the Rebels in *Scotland* againſt their Lawful Queen. The *Presbyterians*, ſeeing Epiſcopal Government ſettled, begin to play their Game.

The Biſhops being thus ſettled, begin the next year, to make Laws and to compoſe Articles of Religion, and to exact a Conformity to them: Upon which they find great oppoſition from the *Presbyterians*.

In her fourth year, ſhe was ſolicited by Pope *Pius*, to ſend her Orators, to the Council of *Trent*; which ſhe refus'd to do. The Emperour alſo writ to her to deſiſt from theſe Alterations of Religion, and to return to the Antient Catholick Faith of her Predeceſſors.

In her fifth year, the Articles of Religion were agreed on in the Convocation.

In her ſixth year, ſhe would have Married the Earl of *Leiceſter* to the Queen of *Scots*. *Calvin* dies this year, and *Cartwright* the great promoter of *Presbytery*, retires out of *England*, upon a diſcontent to *Geneva*.

In her ſeventh year, the *Calviniſts* began firſt to be called *Puritans*.

Dr.

Dr. *Heylyn.*

In her eighth year, the Government of the Church, by Archbiſhops, and Biſhops, was Confirm'd. And for this we are beholding to *Boner*, the late Biſhop of *London*: Who being call'd up to take the Oath of *Supremacy*, by *Horn* of *Winton*, refus'd to take the Oath, upon this account, becauſe *Horn's* Conſecration was not good and valid by the Laws of the Land.

Which he inſiſted upon, becauſe the *Ordinal*, Eſtabliſh'd in the Reign of King *Edward* the VI. (by which both *Horn*, and all the reſt of Queen *Elizabeths* Biſhops, received Conſecration) had been Repealed by Queen *Mary*, and not reſtor'd by any Act of Parliament, in the preſent Reign: (which being firſt declar'd, by Parliament in the Eighth of this Queen, to be *Caſus Omiſſus*; or rather, that the *Ordinal* was look'd upon as a part of the Liturgy, confirm'd in the Firſt year of this Queen:) They next Enacted, and Ordain'd, That all ſuch Biſhops, as were Conſecrated by it, in time to come, ſhould be reputed to be lawfully Conſecrated.

Baker.

In her Eleventh year, there aroſe a Sect, openly condemning the receiv'd Diſcipline of

of the Church of *England*, together with the Church Liturgy, and the very Calling of Biſhops.

This Sect ſo mightily encreas'd; that in the Sixteenth year of her Reign, the Queen, and Kingdom, was extreamly troubled with them.

In the ſame Sixteenth year, were taken at *Maſs*, in their ſeveral Houſes, the Lord *Morley's* Lady, and her Children; the Lady *Gilford*, and the Lady *Brown*: Who being thereof Endicted, and Convicted, ſuffer'd the Penalties of the Laws.

In her Twentieth year, the ſevere Laws againſt *Roman Catholicks*, were Enacted.

In her Twenty third year, a Proclamation was ſet forth, That whoſoever had any Children beyond Sea, ſhould by a certain day, call them home; and that no Perſon ſhould harbour any *Seminary Prieſt*, or *Jeſuit*. At this time alſo there aroſe up in *Holland* a certain Sect, naming themſelves, *The Family of Love*.

In a Parliament held the 26*th*. year of her Reign, the *Puritan Party* labour'd to have Laws made, in order to the deſtroying of the Church of *England*, and the ſetting up of their own Sect.

In her Twenty eighth year, the Queen gave a ſpecial Charge to *Whitgift*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, to ſettle an Uniformity in the Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, which lay now almoſt a gaſping. And at this time,

the

the Sect of *Brownists* (deriv'd from one *Robert Brown*) did much oppose the Church of *England*.

In her One and Thirtieth year, the *Puritan-Flames* broke forth again.

In her Thirty sixth year, the Severity of the Laws were Executed upon *Henry Barrow*, and the Sectaries, for condemning the Church of *England*, as no Christian Church: *Thus Sir* Rich. Baker.

Here is an End of this Work. Wherein, I hope, there is full satisfaction given, concerning the Alterations of Religion, which have been made by Publick Authority, in the Reigns of these Kings and Queens: With a sufficient discovery of the Actings of the *Presbyterians* in this Nation, and the ground of multiplying other Sects.

Here ends the Historical Collections.

Gentlemen

Gentlemen of the Reformation, *this following Diſcourſe I aſſure you, is not intended to make any Reflection upon your Tenets; but meerly out of zeal to your good, and deſiring the Almighty to give you his Grace, not to be deluded by the Principles of the firſt promoters of the* Reformation: *For it may well be, that every one of you does not know the Principles of thoſe firſt Authors of the* Reformation; *therefore out of Charity and zeal to you, and the good of your Souls I declare them here.*

The Preface to the Children of the Reformation.

BE not concern'd to know whoſe Hand it is which holds the Link, but follow the Light it gives; directing you to a view of the Principles upon which the *Reformation* ſupports it ſelf, aſſerting a Holy Liberty to each Perſon; and to act as he pleaſes, with a ſafe Conſcience, according to the Principles of our *Reformation*;

tion; to grant any humane Power can oblige our Conſciences againſt our Judgements in matters of Religion, is but an imaginary Remedy for a real Evil. Our common *Reformation* is cemented, and was firſt rais'd upon this Holy Liberty, that every one ſhould read Scripture, Interpret it for himſelf; and believe what he thought was the true Senſe of it, without any compulſion or conſtraint, and not to believe either *Church*, *State*, *Univerſity*, or *Doctors*, if he did not judge by Scripture his Doctrine was true. Conſidering the Infancy of the *Reformation*; our bleſſed Reformers taking to themſelves, and giving to others this Holy Liberty for to Teach and Believe whatever they judg'd to be the Doctrine and true Senſe of Scripture; though it ſhould be againſt the received Opinion of the *Councils*, *Church*, *Univerſities* and *Doctors*? Look into the Reign of *Edward* the VI. then did our *Reformation* flouriſh in *England*; and was miraculouſly propogated by the Liberty of *Martin*, *Bucer*, *Cranmer*, *Ochinus*, *Peter Martyr*, and others in teaching *Calviniſm*, *Lutheraniſm*, *Zuinglianiſm* by Scripture, as every one underſtood it: Deſcend to the Reign of Queen *Mary*, then the light of the Goſpel was ecclipſed, (in the ſenſe of the *Reformers*) becauſe the flock was again *Popiſhly* compell'd to believe, not what every one judg'd by Scripture to be true; but what the Church judg'd was ſuch: Come down a ſtep

lower

lower to Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, then the flock recovering their holy Liberty to believe what each one thought was the Doctrine of Scripture, the *Reformation* gain'd ground, and our *Proteſtancy* was eſtabliſh'd the Religion of the Land, which others were not totally ſuppreſs'd. Step down a degree lower to King *James* his time; the *Reformation* held its courſe, becauſe their Conſciences were not oppreſs'd. Look down a ſtep lower to King *Charles* the I's Reign; His Majeſty carried with a Godly Zeal of reſtraining the diverſity of Opinions, would by new Laws and Ordinances force the flock to an Uniformity of Doctrine, then thoſe of the *Reformation* pleaded for the Evangelical Liberty, to believe nothing, nor uſe any Rites or Ceremonies, but as each one judg'd by Scripture to be convenient; they Covenanted againſt Biſhops. Laſtly, look upon our Realm as it is at preſent, the ſymptoms of diſſatisfactions, which you may read and hear in *Coffee-Houſes*, in publick and private Converſations; the ſparkles of Jealouſies, which appear in the Kingdom; the Cabals againſt our Government; the animoſity of divided Parties, the murmur and complaints of all; what's all this but the ſmoke of that hidden fire of Zeal, where with *Proteſtants* would force *Presbyterians* by *Penal Laws*, to profeſs their Tenets; which each Opinion endeavour to oppreſs the other; do but duly conſider each Sect, and they will all appear

Ty-

Tyrants over our Conſcience: For no one Sect among us, but would root out all the reſt, none fearing that danger whereof St. *Paul Gal.* 5. 15. warns us, *If we bite and devour one another, let's take heed, we be not conſumed one of another*; Giving us likewiſe a wholſom advice in the ſame place, how to prevent this Evil, *&c.*

When this Kingdom profeſs'd the *Popiſh* Religion, to prevent this Evil of variety of Opinions, their Rule of Faith, was Interpreted by the Church; and was kept from the hands of the flock. No man permitted to give any other Interpretation or Senſe of it, but what the Church did approve. Then the Reformers *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Zuinglius*, *Beza* and others, who freed from this ſlavery laid it down for their Rule of Faith; That any man of ſound Judgement may believe whatever he takes to be the ſenſe of *Scripture*; theſe are the Principles from which the *Reformation* proceeded: No man is to be conſtrain'd to believe any Doctrine againſt his Judgement and Conſcience, and therefore it is quite contrary to the Spirit of the *Reformation* to force us by *Acts of Parliament*, *Decrees of Synods*, *Invectives*, and *Perſecutions* of Indiſcreet Brethren, to drive us to this or that Religion: No, every one ought to be Permitted to believe what he pleaſes; as for inſtance, If he thinks *Bigamy*, or *Self-Murder* to be the Doctrine of Scripture, to have freely liberty to profeſs and practice the ſame.

In

In the first place, let my Reader consider, that the Pure and *Orthodox Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, I purpose in this Treatise to describe in its native Colours.

It's the Doctrine of the *Reformation* that we may with a safe Conscience be to day *Protestants*, to morrow *Lutherans*, in *France Hugonots*, in *Hungary Trinitarians*, in *Poland Socinarians*; and in *London* of any Religion but *Popery*; they allow to be Lawful to change Religion as Time and Occasion require; this is the practice of the first *Reformers*. This Truth requires not much to justify it; be pleas'd only to consider, how you came to Change the Antient Religion profess'd in the Kingdom for 1500 years together

It's uncontestedly true that the Rule of Faith in common to the whole *Reformation* is Scripture, as the humble of Heart, assisted with the Spirit of the Lord, understand it; for *Lutherans* will never admit their Rule of Faith to be Scripture, as Interpreted by the Church of *England*, but as Interpreted by themselves; nor will *England* admit Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, as it is Interpreted by the *Presbyterians*, but as Interpreted by the Church of *England*: So that the Doctrine of each Congregation is but Scripture, as interpreted by them, and whereas all these Congregations joyntly compose the whole Body of the *Reformation*, and each Congregation

Congregation is truly a Member of the Reformation, the Doctrine of the Reformation comes to be Scripture, as each Congregation, and Perſon of ſound Judgement among them, Interprets it. This being an uncontrouled truth, what Man of ever ſo ſound Judgement, but may read to day Scripture, as Interpreted by the *Lutheran* Church, and judging in his Conſcience that Interpretation and Doctrine to be true; conſequently he may with a ſafe Conſcience profeſs that Religion: Soon after he may meet *Calvin*'s Books, and charm'd with the admirable ſtrength of his reaſons and gloſſes upon Scripture, he may judge in his Conſcience, he is to be preferr'd before *Luther*, and ſo may lawfully forſake *Lutheraniſm* for *Calviniſm*; then again he hits upon Scripture as Interpreted by the Church of *England*, whoſe Doctrine raviſhes him with that decency of Ceremonies, that Majeſty of her Liturgy, that Harmony of her Hierarchy, he is convinc'd it's better than *Calviniſm*, and embraces it: Then again he reads the Works of *Arrius*, and convinc'd by the energy of his Arguments and Texts of Scripture, may alter his judgement, and become an *Arian*.

Wherein can you ſay does this Man tranſgreſs the Doctrine or Principles of the Reformation? Does he forſake the Reformation, becauſe he forſakes *Lutheraniſm* for *Calviniſm*? No ſure; for *Calviniſm* is as much the Reformation as the other: Is

not *Proteſtancy* as much the Doctrine of the Reformation as *Presbytery*? though he changes therefore one for the other, he ſtill holds the Doctrine of the Reformation: Is not the Doctrine of the Reformation Scripture, and that not as *Proteſtants* only or *Presbyterians* interpret it, but as any Congregation, or Man of ſound judgement holds it? It is therefore evident, that according to the Doctrine and Principles of the Reformation, he may with a ſafe Conſcience change Religions, and be to day of one, to morrow of another, until he run over All. Point me out any Congregation (the obſtinate Papiſts excepted,) that will dare ſay I cannot live with a ſafe Conſcience in any other Congregation but in it ſelf, all other Congregations will laugh at it: Why then may not I lawfully forſake any Congregation, and paſs to another; and be in *England* a Proteſtant, in *Germany* a *Lutheran*, in *Hungary* a *Trinitarian* or *Socinian*.

It is againſt the grain of Mans reaſon, that we can with a ſafe Conſcience change Religion; If you be a Proteſtant, and you judge it to be the true Religion, you are bound to ſtick to it, and never to change it.

If I diſcourſe with a Papiſt, I would not wonder he ſhould ſay it's againſt the grain of Mans reaſon to believe it lawful; but I admire that a Child of the Reformation, be he of what Congregation he will, ſhould be ſo ignorant of his principles, as to ſay a Man cannot change Religions when he pleaſes:

Nor

Nor do I undertake to prove againſt the Papiſt, that this is lawful, but I undertake to prove it lawful againſt any Reformed Child, or force him to deny the Principles of the Reformation.

Is it againſt reaſon, that a Man may read to day Scripture, and the *Lutherans* Interpretation upon it, and like it very well; and that he ſhould in this caſe embrace that Religion? Is it againſt the grain of Mans reaſon that this ſame Man ſhould next Year afterwards hit upon *Calvin*'s works upon Scripture, and after better conſideration, think his Doctrine to ſurpaſs that of *Luther*; and could not he then (being obliged to chuſe the beſt,) forſake *Lutheraniſm* and ſtick to *Calviniſm*? And is it againſt Mans reaſon that he after this may meet other Books of *Arians*, *Socinians*, &c. and do the like? Have not we many examples of this in our beſt and moſt renowned Reformers? Did not *Ochinus that great Light* (ſays *B. Bale*) *in whoſe preſence* England *was happy*, reading Scripture, judge the *Reformation* to be better than Popery, and of a *Capuchin* Fryar became one of the Reformed, after ſome Years reading Scripture, he judged *Judaiſm* to be better than the Reformation, and became a Jew: Did not *Martin Bucer*, one of our firſt Reformers of *England*, reading Scripture judge *Lutheraniſm* to be better than Popery, and of a *Dominican* Fryar, became a *Lutherian*? Soon after

reading Scripture, he judged *Zuinglianism* to be better than *Lutheranism*, and become a *Zuinglian*; not long after he became a *Lutheran* again as he Confesses, and forsook *Lutheranism* the second time, and returned again to *Zuinglanism*, as *Sklusser* says. Did not *Cranmer* one of our first Reformers here in *England*, and Composers of the 39 *Articles*, a Wise and religious Man profess Popery in *Henry* the VIII's. time, and Compose a Book in defence of *Real Presence*; then in *Edward* the VI's. time, upon better Consideration he professed *Zuinglianism*, and writ a Book against the *Real Presence*; then again in Queen *Mary*'s Reign, being Sentenc'd to Death, he declared for Popery, but seeing his Recantation would not preserve his Life, he renounced Popery and died a *Zuinglian*. I could tire your Patience in reading, and Mind in relating the number of our Prime and most renowned, as well first Reformers, as Learned Doctors, who without any scruple, chang'd several times their Religions; nor in the Principles of our Reformation ought they to be blam'd: For whereas our Rule of Faith is Scripture, as with the assistance of Gods Spirit we understand it, who doubts but we may to day judge sincerely *Luther*'s sense of it to be true, to morrow we may read with more attention and judge *Arius* his sense to be true; next day that of *Calvin*, and so of the rest:

Epist. ad Noremb. & in Comment. in Jo. 6. & 16. Mat. Theol. Calvin. l. 2. fol. 79.

reſt: I do not think but that we have in *England* many Abbettors of this Doctrine: Alas! how many Biſhops, Deans, and rich Parſons do we know, and have we known who are zealous *Presbyterians*, and declared Enemies of Proteſtancy in our Gracious Soveraign's Exile; and no ſooner was he reſtored, and had Biſhopricks and Eccleſiaſtical Dignities to be given, but they become ſtiff *Proteſtants*.

Obſerve the difference betwixt the Papiſts and us, if of a Papiſt you become of any other Congregation, the Popiſh Church Excommunicate you, thou art lookt upon as an *Heretick*, and *Apoſtate*, a *ſtray'd Sheep*; they will not admit you to their Communion or Liturgy; nay, could they well avoid you, they would never admit you to their Company; and why? becauſe they are fondly perſuaded their own is only true Religion, and all others to be Synagogues of Satan; and if any of us will become a Papiſt, he muſt firſt abjure his former profeſſion: But if of a Proteſtant, you ſhould become a Presbyterian, a Lutheran, Quaker, or of any other of our Societies, you are never looked upon to be a jot the worſe for it; we are not a whit ſcandalized at ſuch changes, which we daily ſee; and it is an unſpeakable bleſſing, with what Accord, Unity, and Charity, you may ſee at our Liturgy and Communion, the *Proteſtant*, *Presbyterian Anabaptiſt*, *Socinian* and *Hugonot*, all praiſing the Lord in one Congregation in our Church,

none bid out of the Church, none Excommunicated, no previous abjuration required of their former Tenets; and there's nothing more frequent among us than to go to the *Protestant* Liturgy in the Morning, in the Evening to the *Presbyterian*, especially if our Interest or Convenience requires it. Can there be a more convincing Proof that we esteem it all alike what Religion and Tenets we profess? Let a *Lutheran* go to *France*; Alas! he will never stick to go to the *Hugonots* meeting and Service; let a *Protestant* go to *Germany*, he will go as cheerfully to the *Lutheran* Church, as in *England* to the *Protestant*: Let a *Hugonot* or *Presbyterian* go to *Hungary*, or *Poland*, he is welcome to the *Trinitarians*, and *Socinians*; and when any of them returns home he will be as before.

Is this Doctrine by the Testimony of any of our Synods? Did any teach that we may with a safe Conscience change our Religion.

Yes, I can produce one: The Synod of *Charenton* in *France*, held about the Year 1634. expressly says, That for our Salvation it's all alike whether you be a *Calvinist*, *Lutheran*, or of any other Congregation of the Reformed; because, says this venerable Synod, *they all agree in Fundamental Points, and the* Lutherans *have nothing of Superstition or Idolatry in their manner of Divine Worship.* Change then as often as you list; be a *Lutheran*, be a *Presbyterian*, be an *Anabaptist*; by the mouth

of

of this Synod you are assur'd you'l never miss to hit right. And I pray can any Synod of our times have more Authority in point of Doctrine then *Luther* our first *Reformer*, a man extraordinarily raised by God, (says the Synod of *Charrenton*,) and repleniſht with his spirit to repair the ruins of his Church, He Teaches *the Elevation of the Sacrament is Idolatry, that he did practice it, and commanded it should be practised in the Church of* Wittemberg *to spite the Devil* Carolostadius: Giving you to understand, that for just reasons, you may teach now one Religion, then another. *Zuinglius* also, whose vertue and learning is known to the World, says, *That God inspired him to Preach what Doctrine was suitable to the times*; which as it often changes, you may often change your Doctrine: And consider you if it be not therefore that Christ our Lord says his *Yoke is easie, and his burden light*, (that is Religion) because we can withdraw our Necks from it, as time and just reason requires.

In parva Confes. Germ. fol 55. & in Col. loq. fol. 100.

To. 2. fol. 202.

What greater Authority has a Synod of *England*, to prove a *Doctrine* to be of the *Reformation*, than a Synod of *France* which I have produced? or than *Luther* and *Zuinlius* our first *Reformers*, inspired by God, to teach us the purity of the Gospel? Was it not from *Luther* and *Zuinglius*, that *England* received the Reformation? and if *England* can

be ſo bold as to ſay they erred in this, what aſſurance can we have, that they erred not in the reſt? But ſince nothing will pleaſe you but a Synod of *England*, you ſhall have not one, but many. Can there be any Synod of *England* of ſo great Authority as our wiſe and prudent Parliament? Read our Chronicles and you'l find that in a few years time, they changed and eſtabliſhed different Religions by publick Acts of Parliament: In *Henry* the VIIIs. Reign they Voted for Popery, and made Acts and Statutes againſt the Reformation; in *Edward* the VI's. time they baniſht Popery and voted for *Zuinglianiſm*; in Queen *Mary*'s they pull'd down this, and ſet up Popery again; in Queen *Elizabeth*'s, they decried this, and ſet up not *Zuinglianiſm*, but *Proteſtancy*; in the midſt of her Reign, they poliſht this, and added ſome new perfections to it; In King *James*, and ſucceeding Kings times, *Proteſtancy* was of a different ſtamp from that of Queen *Elizabeth*'s: Hear *Dove* in his *Exhort. to the* Engliſh *Recuſants*, An. 1603. Page 31, *Edward the* VI. *had his Liturgy, which was very good, but condemned it, and brought in another Compoſed by* Peter Martyr: *In* Elizabeth's *time, that was condemned, and another approved; and in the middle of her Reign, her Liturgy was alſo miſliked, and a new one introduced; we are ſo wanton that nothing will content us but Novelties.*

Dove

Dove does not commend this *Doctrine*, for he calls that frequent exchange of Religion, *Wantonneſs*, and Love of *Novelties*.

It's no great matter what he ſays of it; my drift is but to convince you that this is the *Doctrine*, and practice of the beſt Member of our Reformation, even of *England*; and if you be convinc'd it's the *Doctrine* of Reformation, you cannot deny but that it is good *Doctrine*, though *Dove* calls it *Wantonneſs*.

Some of the Reformed ſays, We *are bound to have Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, and the Saviour of the World.* This is the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion, be an *Arian*, be a *Presbyterian*, a *Socinian*, or what you pleaſe, be alſo plung'd up to the ears in wickedneſs of Life and Manners, ſo you have Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, Son of God, and Redeemer of the World, and live in Charity, you will be a Member of the true Church, and be ſaved. Do not imagine this is any new Doctrine invented by me; ſearch the vulgar ſort of our Reformed Brethren, you ſhall get thouſands of this Opinion in our Realm; ſearch then Books of our Learned Doctors, you ſhall find it in them alſo. Doctor *Morton* in his much applauded Book, Dedicated to Queen *Elizabeth*, for which he deſerved a Biſhoprick, ſays, *The Arian Church is to be eſteemed a true Church, becauſe they hold the true ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion,*

The Kindom of *Eſra.* pag. 9.

Religion, which is Faith in Jesus Christ, *Son of God, and Redeemer of the World:* And again in the same place. *Sect.* 4. whose Title is, *Hereticks are Members of the Church.* Therefore *John Fox*, Dr. *Field*, and *Illiricus*, say the *Greek* Church, notwithstanding their error in denying the *Procession* of the *Holy Ghost*, from the *Son*, are holy Members of the true Church, because they have Faith in Jesus Christ.

Acts & mon. pag. 36. lib. 3. c. 5. §. *Catal. testium.* p. 976. & 978.

For what is the Doctrine of the *Reformation*, but as we have said in our Principles, Scripture as Interpreted by any Man of sound judgement in the Church? and were not Doctor *Morton*, *Fox*, *Field*, and *Illiricus*, Men of sound judgement, eminent for Learning and Godliness? If therefore this be Scripture, as Interpreted by them, how can you deny it to be the Doctrine of the Reformation,

And what Jesus Christ are we obliged to believe in? For Jesus Christ, as believed by the *Arrians*, *Socinians*, *Luther* and *Calvin*, is far different from Jesus Christ, as commonly believed by the *Protestants*, and *Popish* Church; we believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God, of one and the same substance and nature with the Father; they believe in a Jesus Christ Son of God, but of a distinct and different nature.

Pish!

Pish! That's but a Nicety; believe what you please, and what you understand by Scripture to be true, and have Charity.

Let us ask the *Reformers* what *Rule* of *Faith* we must observe.

Protestants will say, that *Scripture* and *Apostolical Tradition*; but *Protestants* say of *Papists*, and *Presbyterians*, and *Anabaptists* say of *Protestants*, that many *humane Inventions* are obtruded upon us as *Apostolical Traditions*; that we have no way to discern the one from the other, and consequently *Tradition*, as being an unknown thing unto us, cannot be our *Rule*; others will say, that *Scripture*, and the indubitable consequence of it, is our *Rule*, all will grant this; but then enters the controversy, if the consequences of *Lutherans* be such, and if the consequences of *Presbyterans* be indubitable consequences out of *Scripture*, and each Congregation will say, that their peculiar Tenets are indubitable consequences out of *Scripture*, and the rest must allow it to be of the Reformation; Others will say that *Scripture*, and the four first *Councils* with the *Apostles*, and *Athanasius*'s *Creed* are our *Rule* of *Faith*; but most of the Assembly will no more admit the *four first*, than the *subsequent Councils*, not *Athanasius*'s *Creed*, more than that of *Trent*, nor will the *Quakers*, *Socinians*, and others value the *Apostles Creed*.

But

But there is none of all the Assembly, who will not admit *Scripture*, to be a sacred and full *Rule* of *Faith*, because it's repleniſhed with divine Light, and all Heavenly inſtruction neceſſary for our ſalvation: And ſuch as add, as a *part* of our *Rule* of *Faith*, the *Apoſtles* or *Athanaſius Creed*, or the *four firſt general Councils*, will confeſs that all they contain, is expreſſed in Gods *written Word*, and are but a plainer, or more diſtinct *expreſſion* or *declaration* of the Contents of *Scripture*.

I have been often preſent at ſeveral diſcourſes of *Proteſtants* with *Papiſts*, and never could I hear a *Proteſtant* make *Councils*, *Tradition*, or any thing elſe, the Teſt of their diſcourſe, but only *Scripture*; not but that I could hear them ſay and pretend in their diſcourſes, that *Apoſtolical Tradition*, and the *four firſt Councils* were for them againſt *Popery*; but ſtill their main ſtrength and ultimate refuge was *Scripture*; for whenever they harp upon that ſtring of *Tradition* and *Councils*; the *Papiſts* are viſibly to hard for them, and then they run to *Scripture*, than which there is no *plus ultra*. I have been alſo often at ſeveral diſcourſes betwixt *Proteſtants*, *Presbyterians*, and our Brethren of *other Congregations*, I have obſerved that the Proteſtant, for to defend his Liturgy, Rites and Ceremonies of the *Church of England*, and her Epiſcopacy againſt the others could never defend himſelf

by

by Scripture alone, but plac'd his main ſtrength in Tradition, Primitive Councils, and ancient Fathers, all which the other rejected and reproached the Proteſtants with Popery.

For it's certain, *Lutherans* will not admit Scripture as Interpreted by *Proteſtants*, but as Interpreted by themſelves; and ſo of each other Congregation.

Nor was it only *Luther* and *Calvin* ſpoke thus, but all our bleſſed Reformers; and why? becauſe our Rule of Faith is Scripture, not as interpreted by the Church of *England*, (*France* will not admit it,) nor as Interpreted by the Quaker, (the Anabaptiſts, and Independents, will not hear it) nor as interpreted by *Luther*, (*Calvin* rejects it) nor as interpreted by *Calvin*, (*Thorndike* and *Bramhall* will not yield to it,) nor will *Stillingfleet* ſtand to their Interpretation; nor others to that of *Stillingfleet*. Finally our Rule of Faith is *Scripture*, not as interpreted by any, but as each Congregation, Synod, particular Doctor, or Man of ſound judgement interprets it, and conſequently what ever Doctrine any man of ſound judgement Interprets it, judges to be of Scripture, is to be eſteem'd the Doctrine of the Reformation; and you may ſafely believe it, if you like it, and remain ſtill as truly a Reformed Child, as the proudeſt *Proteſtant* of *England*.

The Rule of Faith is Scripture, as any particular Doctor or perſon of ſound Judgement underſtands it? Behold

Behold how convincingly; first we have heard *Luther* quoted, but now say, We receive nothing but Scripture, but so as that we must have some Authority to Interpret it: Hear him again; d "The Governours and "Pastors have Power to "teach, but the sheep must "give their judgement, "whether they propose "the Voice of Christ, or "of strangers. And again, "e Christ has taken from "the Bishops, Councils, and Pastors, the "right of Doctrine; and given it to all "Christians in general; and the Rule is "Scripture as each one will think fit to in-"terpret it. *And in consequent to this, we "have heard him say above,* I will be free and "will not submit to Doctors, Councils, or "Pastors, but will teach whatever I think "to be true. *Barlow,* The Apostles have "given to each particular Man, the right and "power of Interpreting, and judging by "his inward spirit what is true; it is need-"less that any Man, or Angel, Pope, or "Council, should instruct you, the spirit "working in the Heart and Scripture are to "each particular Person most assured Inter-"preters. *Bilson Bishop of Winchester, says "the same,* g The people must be discerners "and judges of what is taught. Our Reli-"gion has no other rule of Faith (*says our "French Reformation by the mouth of* Du "Moulin,

d *In Colloq. mensal. fol.* 118. e *To. Witt. fol.* 374. f *In Defens. Art. Reliq. Protest.* Pag. 199. g *In his true difier. par.* 2. pag. 353.

"Moulin, *h* Drelincourt, *and* "*the holy Synod of* Charenton) "but the written Word of "God, as Interpreted by us.

h *Bouclay de lay Foy.*

It matters not so much for you to know what I approve or condemn; but to know what the Doctrine of the *Reformation* is; It is this; That none can Teach, Preach, Administer Sacraments, or Exercise Ecclesiastical Functions, if he be not in Holy Orders, *Bishop*, *Priest*, or *Deacon*; for the Church of *England* teaches it, and you may believe it if you please. You may also deny it and say, any *Woman* or *Tradesmen* has as much power to Preach and administer the *Sacraments*, as the ablest Bishop in *England*: This also is the Doctrine of the *Reformation* as well as the former, because *Quakers*, *Presbyterians*, *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, &c. Believe and Teach this, and they are men of as *sound judgement*, and as good *Reformers* as the *Protestants*; nay, the most learned of our *Reformers* allow *Women* a right to exercise *Spiritual Functions*, and Administer the *Sacraments*; *Samaise*, *Peter Martyr*, and *Zuinlius*, expresly defend the Priesthood as well of *Women* as *Men*: And *Luther* proves it strongly "The first Office of "a *Priest*, *says he*, is to Preach; "this is common to all, even "*Women*; the second to *Baptize*, which is also

In lib ad Corin. c. 11. in Explan. Art. 17. To. 2. de minist. Eccles. instit. fol. 369. lib. de Cap. Babil. c. de Ordin. & lib. de abroganda Missa.

"also common to *Women*; the third is to "*Consecrate Bread* and *Wine*, and this also "is common to *all*, as well as to *Men*: and in "the absence of a *Priest*, a *Woman* may *Ab-* "*solve* from *Sins* as well as the *Pope*, because "the words of Christ, Whatever ye shall "untye on Earth shall be untyed in Heaven, "were said to all Christians.

And when so eminent *Men* had not said it, *Reason* and *Scripture* convinces it; *Reason*, because that our *Rule of Faith* being *Scripture*, as each Person of sound judgement understands it; many *Women* undoubtedly are of sound judgement, and why should not their Interpretation of *Scripture* pass for the Doctrine of the *Reformation*, as well as that of our *Bishops* and *Ministers*? *Scripture*, because we read, the *Samaritan* Woman was the first who preached the *Messias* to the City of *Samaria*, and Christ commanded *Mary Magdalen* to go to Preach his Resurrection to his Disciples; and we know by our Chronicles, that our glorious Queen *Elizabeth* of blessed Memory, did not only govern the state, but was a great Apostoless in Church affairs.

To what purpose then, have we *Bishops* and *Ministers*, who enjoy so vast Revenues, if any *Man* or *Women* can Preach and Administer the *Sacraments* as well as they?

You may believe Bishops and Ministers are very needful for the service of the Church; for they being commonly learned witty Men, and having Wives, they come to instruct

their

Wives ſo well, that the good *Women* come in a ſhort time to be as learned as their Husbands, and as nimble and quick in the Eccleſiaſtical Miniſtery, as if they were permitted to exerciſe it; as ſome [Authors of Credit relate unto us, that a Gentleman of *Conſtance*, writ to his friend in a Village, (about three Leagues diſtant from that City,) whoſe Inhabitants were for the moſt part of our *Lutheran Reformation*; the good Paſtor exhorted his Flock to prepare for *Eaſter Communion*, that none ſhould preſume to come to the *Holy Table*, but ſhould firſt *Confeſs* and receive *Abſolution* of his Sins; *Eaſter Holy days* being come, ſuch a multitude flock'd to *Confeſſion*, that the *Paſtor* could not ſatisfie the Devotion of ſo great a Croud; he called his *Wife* to help him to hear *Confeſſions*, and to give them *Abſolution*, in which *Miniſtery* the good *Lady* did Labour with great ſatisfaction of the *Penitents*; but neither the *Paſtor* nor his vertuous *Conſort* being able to diſpatch ſo great a multitude, he called his Maid Servant, who did work in the Holy Miniſtery with as much expedition as her Maſter. For after all, the Church of *Scotland*, *France*, and all *England*, (*Proteſtants* excepted,) will tell you that *Biſhops* and *Miniſters* are not needful, nay, that they are very prejudicial to the *Reformation* and *State*; To the *Reformation*, becauſe this Hierarchy was the Biſhops Court, Surplices, Corner Caps, and

other Trumperies, puts the flock in mind of *Popery*, whereof it's a perfect Reſemblance;

I remember a diſcourſe ſtarted in the *Houſe of Lords*, not many years ago, by his Grace the Duke of *Buckingham*, he deſired to know, what it was to be a *Proteſtant*; and wherein did *Proteſtancy* properly conſiſt? The Biſhops, who were preſent, looked one upon another, and whether they feared the difficulty of the Queſtion, or that for modeſty's ſake, each expected to hear another ſpeak firſt, they ſtood ſilent for a while; at laſt the Ice was broken by one, others followed, but ſtrangely any two agreed; and all that the Duke could gather out of their ſeveral Anſwers, was, That our *Rule* of *Faith* was *Scripture*, as Interpreted by the Parliament and Church of *England*: Whereupon he concluded, We have been theſe hundred years very buſie to ſettle Religion, and for ought I perceive, we are as unſettled now as at the Beginning: And truly he had great reaſon, if *Religion* and *Faith* be nothing elſe, but that ſenſe of *Scripture* which each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands; for as it is impoſſible we ſhould jump and agree in one ſenſe and meaning of the *Text*, ſo it is impoſſible we ſhall ever be ſettled and agree in *Religion*.

Epiſcopacy is againſt the *Presbyterians*, ſome *Canonical Books* againſt the *Lutherans*, *Supremacy*

Supremacy againſt the *Quakers*, and *Infant-Baptiſm* againſt the *Anabaptiſts*; and yet you own them as your Brethren and Godly Congregations of the *Reformation*; or if you will deny them, they will alſo ſcorn you, and ſay they are more of the *Reformation* than you are? and will you not own the *Arians*, &c. for your Brethren, though you believe the *Trinity* againſt them? You ſay they are *old condemned Hereticks*, and does this Language become a Child of the *Reformed Church*? By whom where they Condemned? Was it not by the *Popiſh Church*? That alſo condemns us, and ſays we are as much *Hereticks* as they; and as we ought not to be ſo called, and judge the *Pope* and *Councils* Sentence againſt us, to be bold, uncharitable, and unjuſt; ſo we muſt ſay of the *Arians*, *Pelagians*, and others condemn'd by them. You ſay *Proteſtants* will never own them to be their Brethren; God forbid the *Proteſtant* Church ſhould be ſo uncharitable to her fellow *Chriſtians*, and ſo unjuſt to themſelves. *B. Morton*, as learned a Man as the Church of *England* bred, ſays the *Arian* Church is a true Church, and will ſay no leſs of the others: But what need we the Teſtimony of any, for what Reaſon ſo convincingly proves? They who talk by one and the ſame *Rule of Faith*, are of one and the ſame Religion; therefore *Lutherans*, *Proteſtants*, *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, do eſteem themſelves to be of

the ſame *Faith* and *Religion*, becauſe they all have the ſame *Rule*, which is *Scripture*, as each Congregation underſtands it: Alſo, notwithſtanding the difference and variety of Congregations in *Popery*, they hold all but one *Faith*, as they ſay; becauſe they have but one *Rule* of their *Belief*, which is their Infallible *Pope* and Church: But it is evident, that thoſe which you call *Antient condemn'd Hereticks*, have one and the ſame *Rule* of *Faith* with our *Reformation*; for ours is *Scripture*, as each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands it, without any obligation of holding the ſenſe of it delivered by *Pope*, Church, Conncils, or any other; therefore our firſt bleſſed *Reformers* did not care what ſenſe of it the Church or *Pope* did hold, when they began to Preach the purity of the Goſpel, but each of them Interpreted it as he thought fit in the Lord, and ſo purged the Church of many Errours: This is the very ſelf-ſame *Rule* of *Faith*, which *Arians*, *Pelagians*, *Neſtorians*, and others, premptorily condemned by *Rome* as *Hereticks*, did follow and walk by: Each of them Read and Interpreted Scripture, Preached and Believed what ſenſe of it they thought to be true, though they knew it was againſt the Doctrine of the Church, looking on *Scripture* alone as their *Rule* of *Faith*, without any regard of the *Pope*, Church, Councils, or Fathers.

Again he ſays, *Epiſt. 2 ad Polon. in Tract. Theol.* pag. 796: That Prayer, *Holy Trinity, one God have mercy of us, is Barbarous, and does not pleaſe me.* And adds f *The Son has his own Subſtance diſtinct from the Father.* His Diſciple g *Danæus*, ſays, *it is fooliſh inſipid Prayer*: And our great Apoſtle *Luther*, (who as *Fox* witneſſeth, was the Chariot and Conductor of *Iſrael*, and a Man extraordinarily raiſed and repleniſh'd with Gods ſpirit, to teach the purity of the Goſpel,) cauſed that Prayer to be blotted out of the Litanies, h *That word Trinity* ſays he, *ſounds coldly*; *my Soul hates that word* Homoouſios, *and the* Arrian *did well in not admitting at.* Laſtly, *Ochinus* that great Oracle of *England*, impugns this Myſtery with a ſtrong diſcourſe: i *We are not obliged to believe*, ſays he, *more than the Saints of the Ancient Teſtament, otherwiſe our condition would be worſe than theirs, but they were not obliged to believe this Myſtery, therefore we are not obliged.* Examine, I pray, the works of theſe eminent Doctors, where I quote them; conſider if they be, not only Men of ſound judgement, but Men extraordinarly raiſed by God, (ſays the Synod of *Charenton*;) the Chariots and Conductors of *Iſrael*, ſays *Fox*: Men to be reverenc'd after Chriſt, ſays our Doctor *Powel*, and Apoſtolical Ora-

f In Act. Sieueti *pag.* 87. l. con. Cenebrard. *h* In Poſtil Major. in enarat. Evang. Domin. Trinit. *i* Lib. 2. Dial. 2.

cles ſent to teach us the purity of the Goſpel, and conclude, it is an undeniable Verity, that this is the Doctrine of the *Reformation*, whereas it's *Scripture*, as Interpreted by ſuch Men: Oh! But *England*, *France*, and *Scotland*, believe this Myſtery. Well! and what then? That proves that the Myſtery is alſo the Doctrine of the *Reformation*, becauſe whatever any man of ſound judgement thinks to be *Scripture*, it is the Doctrine. But is *England* or *France* alone the whole *Reformation*? Are not *Luther Calvin*, *Danæus*, *Ochinus*, as well of the *Reformation*, and men of as ſound judgement as they? Since therefore they underſtand by *Scripture* there is no *Trinity*, it is the Doctrine of the *Reformation* alſo that there's none: Believe it or deny it, which you like beſt, and you'll be ſtill of the *Reformed* Chnrch.

Scripture, as each perſon of ſound judgement interprets it, is our *Rule* of *Faith*: judge you, if that be not a good Principle in our *Reformed* Church, whereas this is the *Rule* of *Faith* given us by all our Doctors, as I prved before, this being our *Rule* of *Faith* and *Reformed Doctrin*, it is evident, that whatever *Doctrine* is judged by any perſon of ſound Judgement to be contained in *Scripture*, is the *Doctrine* of our *Reformation*; others ſay only *Figurative Preſence* is taught in *Scripture*, this alſo is the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*; ſome underſtand by *Scripture*;

there

there is a Myſtery of the *Bleſſed Trinity*, this therefore is the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*: others underſtand there is no ſuch *Myſtery*, this alſo is the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*. ſo that whether you believe or deny this or any other Tenet controverted, you'll ſtill hold the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*.

Calvin *k* ſays, *Chriſt pray'd unadviſedly the Eve of his Paſſion; that he uttered Words whereof he was afterward ſorry: that in his paſſion he was ſo troubled of all ſides, that overwhelmed with deſparation, he deſiſted from invoking God, which was to renounce all hopes of Salvation*; And ſays he, I *if you object it is abſurd and ſcandalous to affirm Chriſt deſpaired*, I anſwer, *This Deſparation proceeded from him as he was man, not as he was God.* And this is not only the *Doctrine* of *Calvin*, but of *Brentius*, m *Marlot*, n *Jacobus*, Miniſter (quoted by *Bilſon*) and of *Beza*. Will you ſay this is the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, or that we cannot without ſcruple believe it? Alſo *Calvin* ſays, o *That Chriſt's corporal Death was not ſufficient for to redeem us, but that after having deſpared on the Croſs, he ſuffered the death of his Soul*; that's to ſay, that

k Harm. in Evang. Mat. c. 26. verſ. 39. and c. 27. verſ. 46, & lib. 2. Inſtit. c. 16. ſect. 10. & 11. *l* In Luk. par 2 hom. 65. and in Joan hom. 54. *m* In March. c. 16. *n* Recogn pag. 376. *o* Lib 2. Inſt. c. 16. ſect. 10. and ſeq. *p* To 3. Wettemp. in ſp. 16. *q* In Pſ 16. *r* In Confeſ. majori de Cœna Dni.

that his Soul after his corporal death, ſuffered the pains of the damned in Hell. And ſays he in the ſame place, *they are but ignorant, doltiſh, brutiſh men, who will deny it.* Luther alſo teaches the ſame *Doctrine*: p *As he ſuffered afterward the death of the Soul in Hell*: Epinus q *a learned* Lutheran, ſays, *Chriſt Deſcended into Hell for thee, and ſuffered not only corporal Death, but the death and fire of Hell.* Mr. *Fulk* and *Perkins* avow this is alſo is the expreſs *Doctrine* of *Illiricus*, *Latimer* and *Loſſius*. Alſo *Luther* moſt impiouſly affirms, that *not the humane Nature of Chriſt died for us, but alſo his Divine Nature*: ſee *Luther*'s words quoted at large by *Zuinglius*, ſ and *Hoſpitian*. It is evident that all thoſe Tenets are undeniably the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*.

m in March. c. 16.
n Recogn. p. 376.
o Lib. 2. Inſtit. c. 16. fact. 10. and ſeq. p To. 3. Wettemp. in ſp. 16.
q In Pſ. 16. r In Confeſ. majori de Cœna Dni. ſ To. 2. in reſponſ. ad Confeſ. Luth. fol. 458. t In Hiſtor. Sacram. par. 2. fol. 75.

He who denies them, cannot in charity check them who believes them, nor can they who believe them, check thoſe who deny them, whereas each follow the *Rule* of *Faith*, and believe what they judge by *Scripture* to be true. And if you or your Church of *England* cry out *Blaſphemy, Blaſphemy*, againſt all that you judge to be falſe, why do not you cry *Blaſphemy* againſt *Presbyterians*,

byterians, *Lutherans*, and other Congregations, from whom you diſſent? And what difference betwixt you and the Church of *Rome*? The ſolly of this is to call *Hereſie* and *Blaſphemy*, all that is not her own *Doctrine*! And all that your Church of *England* miſlikes, muſt be *Fanaticiſm*, *Blaſphemy*, and *Impiety*? Muſt our *Rule* of *Faith* be *Scripture*, as the Church of *England* underſtands it, and not otherwiſe? *Presbyterians*, and *Lutherans*, will never allow it: If therefore our *Rule* of *Faith* be *Scripture*, as each Perſon underſtands it; any Perſon of ſound judgement in the *Reformation*, may without ſcruple believe what he underſtands to be the *Doctrine* of *Scripture*.

Can you deny but this was the *Rule* of *Faith*, and principle of our firſt bleſſed *Reformers*?

If therefore they judged, and if any other judges by that *Rule* and *Principle*, that thoſe *Tenets* which you call *Impious* and *Blaſphemous*, be true *Doctrine*, they cannot be blamed for believing them.

Of the *Reformed* was as Holy, Innocent, Blameleſs and Pure as yours is now. And that you may be convinc'd of this Truth, know *Calvin* expreſly teaches *a* "We believe "the ſins of the Faithful, (*he means of the* "*Reformation*) are but venial Sins; not but "that they deſire Death, but becauſe there

"is

"is no damnation for the Children of Grace, "in asmuch as their sins are "not imputed to them: "*And again he says*, We can "*b* assure our selves, we can "no more be damn'd for "any Sins, then *Jesus Christ* "himself. *c Luther* is of the "Opinion, As nothing but "*Faith* does justifie us, so "nothing but Incredulity is "a Sin. *Again*, *d* No sin is so great that it "can damn a man, such as are damn'd, "are damn'd only for their Incredulity *Whi-* "*taker*, *e* No Sin can hurt a man who has "*Faith*. The same is taught by *Wotton*, *Fulk*, *Tindal*, and *Beza*. It is therefore the *Doctrine* of *Scripture*, as Interpreted by these persons of great and sound judgement, that Incests, Murders, Intemperance or whatever else you call a sin, (incredulity excepted,) either is no Sin at all, or Venial Sins, which do no harm, nor cannot damn the Children of the *Reformation*; if therefore our Brethren who lived in the beginning of the *Reformation*, lived according to *Scripture*, as Interpreted by men of sound judgement, which is the *Rule* of *Faith* and *Manners*, they did not ill, bnt very well, in following it.

a Lib 3. Inst. c. 4. Sect. 28. *b* Lib. 4. c. 7. Sect. 2. *c* In locis commun. classe. 5. 27. *d* To. 2. Wittem. de capr. Babyl. fol. 74. *e* De Eccl. contr Bellarm. conf. 2. quæst. 5.

And it is not pardonable in any *Reformed Child* to say, such Oracles, Extraordinarily raised by God to teach the purity of the *Gospel*,

Goſpel, ſhould have taught their errors in *Doctrine*, or diſſolution of manners. They teach what in their Conſciences they underſtood by *Scripture* to be true; if you will not be ſo irreverent as to ſay, that they were Knaves, who ſpoke and taught againſt their Conſciences and knowledge. Therefore they taught the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, purely and truly: The conſequence is evident: For what is the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, but what wiſe, learned men of ſound judgement think and underſtand by *Scripture* to be true? Why is figurative Preſence the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*? though denied by *Lutherans*, (who are *Reformed* alſo,) but becauſe Wiſe, Learned men judge by *Scripture* as they underſtand it, it is the true *Doctrine*? or can you give me any other *Rule* of *Faith* by which we may know what *Doctrine* is of the *Reformation*, and what not, but *Scripture*, as each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands it? Or what *Rule* can you give for to know what is good or evil to be done, but *Scripture*, as underſtood by ſuch perſons? If therefore *Luther*, *Calvin*, and the other Doctors I quoted, judge by *Scripture* that Doctrine and manner of Life to be true and good, why may not we ſay it's the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*? If you or the Church of *England* or *Scotland*, judge that *Doctrine* to be falſe, and that manner of Life to be a diſſolution and corruption of manners:

Why?

Why? you are men of ſound judgement, you underſtand *Scripture* ſo; that will be the *Doctrine* alſo of the *Reformation*, you may believe it: But you muſt not deny that *Luther* and *Calvin's Doctrine* is alſo of the *Reformation*, becauſe they were men of as ſound judgement as you.

Our *Rule* of *Faith* is *Scripture*, as each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands it, and this is the ſame *Rule* which *Luther* and the *Reformation* in its firſt beginning had: This Holy Liberty is the beſt Jewel, the greateſt Perfection, and moſt glorious Prerogative the *Reformation* has: If therefore now at preſent any man judges by *Scripture*, that he can Marry ten Wives at a time; that he can kill his own Son, as *Abraham* intended; that he may commit Inceſt with his own Daughter, as *Lot* did; that there is no Sin but *Incredulity*, as *Luther* believed; nor any Myſtery of the *Trinity* of Perſons in One Nature, as *Calvin* believed, with what juſtice can the Church of *England* ſay ſuch a man does not believe, and live as becometh a *Reformed Child*, or that his *Doctrine* and *Life* is ſcandalous; whereas he lives and believes as he underſtands by *Scripture*, which is the *Rule* of *Faith* in common to the *Reformation*: The Church of *England* ſays, the *Lutheran Doctrine* of the *Real Preſence* is not the *Doctrine* of *Scripture*; that the *Preſbyterian Doctrine* againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*,

Baptiſm, is not of *Scripture*. Becauſe they follow *Scripture* as they underſtand it. and this is our *Rule* of *Faith*? And why will not you ſay, the Belief and Life of that other man is alſo of the *Reformation*, though it may ſeem abſurd to you; ſince he believes and lives as he judges by *Scripture* he may? It follows therefore plainly, that this is the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*.

The *Rule* of *Faith* is *Scripture*, as each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands it.

f *Beza* teaches, (and ſays it's alſo the *Doctrine* of *Calvin*, *Somaize*, and *Geneva*,) that the Lords Supper may be lawfully adminiſtered in any kind of victuals as well as in Bread and Wine, in Eggs, Fleſh, Fiſh, *&c.* "Where there is no Bread and Wine, *ſays he*, "we may duly celebrate, if inſtead of them "we uſe what we may uſu-"ally eat and drink. *And* "*again in the ſame place*, If "there be no water at hand, "and that Baptiſm cannot "be with Edification de-"ferred, I would baptize "in any other liquor.

g *Luther*, h *Melancthon*, i *Muſculus*, k *Ochinus*, l *Beza*, and others, teach the lawfulneſs of Bigamy or Multiplicity of Wives, and prove it from the example of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*: and *Ochinius* expounding the Text of Saint *Paul*,

f Epiſt. 2. 2. *&* 25.
g *To.* 5. *Wittem. ſerm. de Matrim. & in* 1. *ad Corin.* 7.
h *Conſil. Theol. par.* 1. *pag.* 648. *&* 134. *In Epiſt. Paul ad Phil. & in* 2. *ad Tim.* 3
k *lib.* 2. *Dial.* 21
l *Lib. de Repud. & Divort. p.* 223.

Paul, " It behoveth a *Bishop* to be a Man of " one *Wife* : The prohibition, *says he*, is not " to be understood so, that a *Bishop* should " have but one *Wife* at a time, for certainly " he may have many ; but St. *Pauls* mean- " ing is, that he ought not to have too many " *Wives* at a time, that's to say, ten or " twenty.

The Synod of *Geneva*, *m* and the n *Ecclesiastical Discipline* of *France*, Printed at *Saumure*, has decreed, that a *Wife*, whose *Husband* is a long time absent may have him called by the publick Cryer, and if within a competent time he does not appear, without any further Enquiry, the Ministers may License her to marry any other ; or marry her himself.

m *Canon. Generales Geneven.* 1560.
n *Chap.* 13. *art* 31. o *To.* 5 *Wittem. serm. de Matrim.*

I say all *Women* may practice this *Doctrine* without scruple or shame, whereas it is *Scripture* as interpreted by that thrice holy *Synod*.

Luther p teaches, it is lawful to a *Wife*, if her Husband does not please her, to call her Man-servant, or her Neighbour ; and he gives the like Liberty to the Husbands, if their Wives be pettish or humoursom. " If " the Husband, says he, cannot correct the " humoursomness of his Wife, he may ima- " gine she is dead, and may marry another, " because it's not in the power of a man to " live without a Woman, nor in hers to live " without a man.

This

This is *Scripture* as Interpreted by *Luther*, and conſequently muſt not be denied to be the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*; nor can any of our *Reformation* be juſtly puniſh'd or blam'd for practiſing it, if he judges by *Scripture*, (as *Luther* did) for this is our *Rule* of *Faith*. But *Luther* never gave this Liberty, but upon condition, that the *Husband* or *Wife* ſhould firſt make their complaint before a Magiſtrate, to have a redreſs of their Injury and diſcontent.

Not only *Luther*, but q *Bucer*, r *Melancthon*, ſ *Ochinus*, t *Muſculus* and u *Calvin*, do teach, that a Man who finds his Wife in *Adultery* may caſt her off by Divorce, and Marry another; and our *French* Synods have ordered this *Doctrine* to be put in their *Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline*, ſo that it is the *Doctrine* of *Scripture*, as interpreted by theſe perſons of ſound judgement, and conſequently of the *Reformation*; you may therefore believe and practice it; our *Siſters*, particularly and our Miniſters *Wives*, were much alarm'd at this *Doctrine*, and ſay it is a damnable Hereſie.

q *To.* 5. *Wittemb. ſerm. de Matrim.* r *In Scriptis Anglic. de Reg. Chr. l.* 2. *c.* 26. *& in Matth. c.* 19. ſ *In Conſil. Theol. par.* 1 *pag.* 648. *ſ. &* 134. t *Dial.* 200. *&* 204. *in Epiſt. S. Paul. ad Tim.* 3. u *l.* 4. *Inſt c.* 19. *ſect.* 37. *Diſcip. Eccl. c.* 13. u *Serm. de Matrim.*

Luther ſays it is impoſſible a *u* young man of 20 Years can live without a *Woman*; or a young *maid* of 18 years without a *man*.

It

It is the *Reformed Doctrine*: *Scripture* as interpreted by a ſound judgement,

If a *Popiſh Prieſt*, or a Fryar, did become of our *Reformed Church*, can he lawfully marry, whereas he made a Vow of *Chaſtity*?

It's the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, declared by many *French Synods*, and recorded in their *Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline*, that he muſt be Chriſten'd again, becauſe the firſt *Baptiſm* is ſufficient and valid: believe which you pleaſe. It is alſo the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, that Infant-*Baptiſm* is not at all needful (nay nor Lawful ſay the *Anabaptiſts*) ſo ſays *Calvin* x *Zuinglius*, *Beza*, and many others; it is likewiſe the *Doctrine* of our 39 Articles, y and our holy *Synod* of *London* z, that *Infant-Baptiſm* is Lawful and needful. Believe which you like beſt; both are of the *Reformation*.

x *Lib.* 4. *Inſt. c.* 15. *ſect.* 20. & 21.
y *Act.* 27. z *can.* 21.

We know our great *Zuinglius* himſelf would not at all preach the Goſpel unto the *Switzers*, until that he Preſented a Petition for himſelf and his Companions (all *Prieſts* and *Fryars*) extant yet in his 1 *Tom.* pag. 110. and obtained the Contents of it, which was to have *Wives*. Nor can we doubt this to be the beſt *Doctrine*, whereas *Luther*, *Beza*, and almoſt all our *Reformers* were Prieſts and Fryars, and the firſt ſtep they gave to the *Reformation* was to *marry*. At *Luther*'s marriage, *Eraſmus* his Rallery upon it is much ſolemnized;

ſolemnized; *Luther yeſterday a Monk, to day a Husband, and next day a Father*, becauſe that honeſt *Kate Bore*, his virtuous Bride, was happily delivered of a lovely Boy eight days after he Married her: But the Servant of God did not regret the action, which proves that he judged by *Scripture* it was very lawful.

It is the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, that it was *Jeſus* Chriſt the Son of God who eſtabliſht the Church, you may believe it therefore: It's alſo the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, that it was not *Jeſus Chriſt* the Son of God who eſtabliſht the Church; that this is the *Doctrine* of our *Reformation* is apparent, for it is *Scripture* asInterpreted by *Ochinius* a Man of ſound judgement, *whom all* Italy *could not match*, ſays Calvin; *In whoſe preſence* England *was happy, and unhappy in his abſence*, ſays B. Bale: Ochinus ſpeaks thus, a *Conſidering how the Church was eſtabliſht by Chriſt, and waſht with his Blood; and conſidering again how it was utterly overthrown by the Papacy; I concluded that he who eſtabliſht it, could not be Chriſt the Son of God, becauſe he wanted providence*; and upon this reflection he renounced Chriſt and became a *Jew*. And no man can ſay but that he acted and behaved himſelf like a true Child of the *Reformation* in ſo doing, for he followed *Scripture* as he underſtood it; and as he was a true *Reformed* Child in forſaking *Popery*, becauſe he under-

a *In Prefat Dialog.*

ſtood by *Scripture*. that the *Reformation* was better; ſo ſince he underſtood by reading *Scripture* more, that *Judaiſm* was better than the *Reformation*, he acted like a good *Reformer*, in chuſing that which he underſtood by *Scripture* to be beſt; this is the Reformers *Rule of Faith.*

And if one chuſe to believe that there is a Church eſtabliſht on Earth by Chriſt, you muſt beware never to perſuade your ſelf we are bound to believe her *Doctrine*, or live in her, if you do not judge by Scripture that ſhe teaches the *Doctrine* of Chriſt: This is the moſt eſſential point of *Popery*, an obligation of ſubmitting our judgements to the Church, and believing her *Doctrine* without any more examining, and in this the Church of *England* is much like the *Popiſh Church*, which by Acts of Parliaments and other ſeverities would oblige all men to believe her *Doctrine*, *Rites*, and *Ceremonies*: No, God has given us *Scripture* for our *Rule of Faith*, as we forſook the *Popiſh* Church, becauſe we diſcovered by *Scripture* her many errours in *Doctrine*; ſo we are not bound to believe the *Doctrine* of any other Church, but as we find by *Scripture* her *Doctrine* is true. Do, and ſpeak as *Luther* to 1. *Edit. Jen. in reſult. I will be free, and will not ſubmit to the Authority of* Councils, Popes, Church *or* Univerſity; *to the contrary, I will confidently teach whatever I judge to be true; whether it be the* Catholick Doctrin *or* Heretical; *condemned or approved.* Muſt

Muſt I own and believe, that the *Doctrin* of Jeſus Chriſt, delivered to his Apoſtles and the Church is true *Doctrine*?

The *Reformation* teaches, it is, and you may ſafely believe it: You may as ſafely believe it is not after the principles of the *Reformation*; becauſe it teaches that Chriſt err'd in *Doctrin* and *Manners*: *Verè Phariſæi erant viri valdè boni*, ſays Luther; b *& Chriſtus minimè debuit eos taxare*: and Calvin ſays, c *it's a folly to think he was not ignorant in many things*; laſtly, *David George*, d (a man of God and of a holy life, ſays *Oſiander*) writes, *If the* Doctrine *of Chriſt and his Apoſtles had been true and perfect, the Church which they planted had continued, but now it is manifeſt that Antichriſt hath ſubverted it, as it is evident in the* Papacy: *therefore it was falſe and imperfect.* See theſe words quoted in the Hiſtory of *David George*, Printed by the Divines of *Baſil*, at *Antwerp*, *Anno* 1668. both *Doctrines* are *Scripture*, as Interpreted by Men of ſound judgement; and ſo a Child of the *Reformation*, may believe which he will,

b Serm de 50 Artic. in ſumma ſummarum. c In Harm. ſuper Luc c. 8. d Epitom. Cent. 16. par. 2.

Zuinglius, e one of the greateſt Oracles of our Church ſays, *It's a great ignorance to believe any Infallible Authority in the Goſpels or Epiſtles of the* Apoſtles; *Beza*, not inferiour to *Zuinglius*, blotted out of St. *John* the

e *Tom.* 2. *cont. catabapt. fol.* 10.

History of the Woman Adultress, judging it a Fable; *Clebitius* affirms, *that* Luke's relation of Christ's passion is not true, because it does not agree with that of *Matthew* and *Mark*, and more credit is to be given to two, than to one. g *Calvin says*, Peter consented to, and added to the Schism of the Church, to the overthrow of Christian liberty, and Christ's Grace. h *Whitaker says*, It's "evident that after "the Descent of the *Holy* "*Ghost*, the whole Church, "even the *Apostles* erred; and "*Peter* erred in *Doctrin* and "*Manners*. i *Luther*, *says* "*Peter* liued and taught *ex*-"*tra Verbum Dei*; and *Bren*-"*tius* k his Disciples say, "that *Peter* and *Barnabas* together with the "Church of *Jerusalem* erred after receiving "the *Holy Ghost*. If our *Rule of Faith* be *Scripture*, as each person of sound judgement understands it, undoubtedly this must be the *Doctrin* of the *Reformation*, and may be believed by any *Reformed*, since it is *Scripture*, interpreted by such renowned men.

f *Victoria verit. arg.* 5. g *In cap.* 2. *ad Gal.* h *de Eccles. cont.* Bellarm. *cont.* 2. *q.* 4. i *To.* 5. *Wertem. an.* 1554. *in Epist. ad Gal. c.* 1. k *In Apol Conf. c. de Concil.*

As to the true *Canonical Books* of *Scripture*.

The *Reformation* teaches, and you may believe with the Church of *England*, that St. *Paul*'s Epistle to the *Hebrews*, those of *James* and *Jude*: the 2 of St. *Peter*; the 2. and 3 of St. *John*, are true *Canonical Scripture*;

ture; the *Reformation* alſo teaches they are not *Canonical*, becauſe *Lutherans* deny them; believe which you like beſt.

But if you'll live in peace, and out of ſtrife with *Proteſtants*, *Lutherans*, and others, who diſpute, whether that of this or that Church be *Canonical Scripture*; your readieſt way will be, to ſay there's no true *Canonical Scripture*; *Scripture* is no more to be regarded than other pious Books: if you ſay this is not the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, read *de expreſſo Verbo Dei, & lib. de Har.* where he relates this to be the *Doctrine* of the *Swinckfeldians*, as good *Reformers* as the beſt of us: they ſay, that we are not to regard any Inſtruction from Man or Book, but Gods immediate inſpiration, which ſpeaks ſecretly to our hearts; for which they alledge thoſe comfortable words of the Prophet, *I will hear what my Lord my God will ſpeak in me*: for ſay they, the Book which we call *Scripture*, is a Creature, and we muſt not ſeek for light and inſtruction from any Creature, but from God the Father of Lights. This is *Scripture* as interpreted by men of ſound judgement; any Child of the *Reformation* may believe it.

It is the *doctrine* of the *Reformation* that you cannot, becauſe God has forbid it, add to, and take away from his Word. It is alſo the *doctrine* of the *Reformation*, and the practice of our beſt *Reformers*, when the *Text* does not ſpeak clear enough, that to refute *Popery* and eſtabliſh our *doctrine*,

we may add or diminiſh a word or two, which is not to change the Word of God, but to make it ſpeak more expreſly: as when *Luther* had a mind to preach *juſtification by Faith alone*, finding the *Text* ſaid but, *Man is juſtified by Faith*, he added the word *Alone* and made the *Text* very clear againſt *Popery*, which formerly was ſomewhat obſcure: *Zuinglius* being to teach the *figurative preſence* of Chriſt in the Sacrament, found the Text, *This is my Body*, to be too pat againſt his *doctrine*, and inſtead of *Is*, put in *This ſignifieth*. The Church of *England* being to preach up the Kings Spiritual Supremacy, could not convince the obſtinate *Papiſts* by the Original Text, which ſaid, 1 Pet. 2. *ſubmit your ſelves anto every humane creature for the Lord's ſake, whether it be to the King as excelling, or to*, &c. But in King *Edwards* time they altered one word, and made the Text thus, *ſubmit your ſelves to every Ordinance of Man, whether it be to the King, as being the chief head*, and the following impreſſions of the Bible, in the year 1557. and 79. ſay, *To the King as Supream*. And ſo the true Doctrine is clearly made out from Scripture, as alſo the lawfulneſs of *Prieſts* Marriages; for the Text before the Reformation ſaid 1 Cor. 9. *Have we not power to lead about a woman or a ſiſter*; and now our Bibles ſay, *Have we not power to lead about a Wife being our Siſter*: Hence it is evident according to the Doctrine and practice of our Reformation, that when you have a

mind

mind to eſtabliſh a Doctrin which you judge to be true, you may change the Text and make it ſpeak your ſenſe and meaning, provided you judge your ſenſe to be true.

Does *Faith alone* juſtify us?

It is the Doctrin of the Reformation, that without Charity it cannot, becauſe St. *Paul* ſays, 1 Cor. 13. *If I have Faith ſo as to move Mountains, and no Charity, I am nothing.* It is alſo the Doctrine of the Reformation, that it is impious and wicked to ſay, *Faith alone* without Charity does not juſtify; this is Scripture as interpreted by *Luther* a Man of a ſound judgement: *l* "Who ſay, *quoth Luther* that Faith alone, though perfect it be, "cannot juſtify without Charity, ſay impiouſly and wicked, becauſe "*Faith* alone without any "good works doth juſtifie. Believe which Doctrine you pleaſe, both are of the Reformation.

l In cap. 2 ad Gal. & ſerm. Aug. pag. 204. m *In Epiſt. ad Gal. c.* 1. & 2. & *Tom.* 5. *Witemb. an.* 1554. *fol.* 29.

As to St. *Pauls* Doctrine, *Luther* anſwers, "*m* Be it, *ſays he*, that the "Church, *Auguſtine*, or other Doctors, alſo "*Peter* and *Paul*, nay, and an Angel from "Heaven ſhould teach otherwiſe than I "teach, yet my *doctrine* is ſuch, that it ſets "forth Gods Glory; I know I teach no humane, but divine *doctrine.*

It is the *doctrine* of the Reformation, that *Faith* alone, without any good Works, (notwithſtanding all ſins you are guilty of,) doth

juſtifie you: This is Scripture as Interpreted by *Luther*, who ſays, nothing can damn you but Incredulity, as nothing but *Faith* can ſave you; ſo *Whitaker*, *Wotton*, *Fulk*, and *Beza*, whoſe Words I related, which I believe you remember, and I need not repeat.

It is alſo the *doctrine* of the Reformation, that Good Works are meritorious of Grace and Glory; n *Hooker* and *Harmonia confeſſ.* o ſay it's the *doctrine* of Scripture; and what any perſon of ſound judgement judges to be the *doctrine* of Scripture, he may believe it, for this is our Rule of *Faith*. It's likewiſe the *doctrine* generally of all our Church, that good Works are not at all meritorious: *Tindal* (called by *Fox* p, a man of God, and a conſtant Martyr) judges this to be ſo true, that in his Treatiſe *de Mammona iniquitatis*, he ſays, *Chriſt himſelf did not by all his good works merit Glory*: And though the Scripture ſays expreſly he did, *Calvin* q affirms *that it is a fooliſh curioſity to examine, and a raſh propoſition to ſay Chriſt did Merit.*

n *Lib.* 5. *de Eccl. Polit. ſect.* 72.
o pag. 495. &
273. p *Acts and Mon.* pag. 514.
q *Lib.* 2. *Inſt. c.* 17.

It is the *doctrine* of the Reformation, that though good Works be not meritorious, nor have not the leaſt influence in our Juſtification or Salvation, yet they are abſolutely needful for both, in as much as true *Faith* cannot be without good Works, becauſe they are the marks and ſigns of a *living Faith*,

by

by which alone we are Saved; this is the judgement of the Church of *England* expreſſed in the 11 and 12 *Articles* of the 39, and of *Melanchthon in locis Commun. de Bonis operibus*, and you may believe it: You may alſo believe, and it is the *doctrine* of the Reformation, that good works are ſo far from being needful, that they are prejudicial and hurtful to our Salvation, and the beſt way to be Saved, is to do no good Works at all; this is Scripture as Interpreted by *Illyricus*, *Amarſdortius*, quoted in *Act. Colloq. Aldeburg.* pag. 205. and 299. and *Luther* r was deeply perſwaded of this truth, though Chriſt ſaid, "If thou will enter "into the Kingdom of Hea- "ven, keep the Command- "ments: *Luther* ſays, *It is* "*an obſtacle to our Salvation to* "*keep them*; Where it is ſaid, *quoth he*, that "Faith in Chriſt doth indeed juſtify us, but "that it is neceſſary alſo to keep the Com- "mandments, there Chriſt is denied, and "Faith aboliſh'd, becauſe that which is pro- "per to Faith alone is attributed to the "Commandments. *And again*, ſ *ſays he*, "If Faith be accompanied with good Works, "it is no true Faith; that it may juſtifie it "muſt be alone, without any good Works. This is Scripture as interpreted by ſuch ſound Men; and conſequently the Doctrine of the Reformation; and who doubts but that any Doctrine of the Reformation may be

r *In comment in cap. 2. ad Gal.*
ſ *To. 1 Propoſit. 3.*

be believed. For our *Rule of Faith* is Scripture, as each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands it; and in believing thoſe *Tenets*, becauſe they judge them to be the Doctrine of Scripture they ſtick faſt to, and follow our Rule of Faith: Why is the *Figurative Preſence*, and the *Kings Supremacy*, the Doctrine of the Reformation, though denied by *Papiſts*, *Lutherans*, and *Presbyterians*; but becauſe the *Proteſtants* judge it's the *Doctrine* of Scripture: If therefore thoſe great Authors I quoted, and any other with them, judge thoſe *Tenets* to be the *Doctrine* of Scripture, they may be juſtly called the *Doctrine* of the Reformation: Muſt *Proteſtants* be forced againſt their judgements to deny *real Preſence* and *Supremacy*, becauſe *Lutherans* ſay it's wicked *Doctrine*. And why muſt *Luther*, *Flaccius*, *Illiricus*, and others be forced to deny thoſe *Tenets*, though *Proteſtants* or *Papiſts* judge them to be damnable? Let each one believe what he thinks to be the *Doctrine* of Scripture, and he will ſtill be a true Reformed Child.

Does our Reformation teach that 'tis poſſible to all Men, aſſiſted with Gods Grace to keep the Commandments?

This is the *Doctrine* of the Church of *England*, and conſequently of the Reformation: It is alſo the Doctrine of the Reformation delivered out of Scripture, as Interpreted by *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Willet*, and ſeveral others, that it's impoſſible to any man aſſiſted with what

what Grace ſoever to keep the Commandments. "None has ever yet, *ſays our great* "Calvin, and God has decreed none ſhall "ever keep the Commandments. *Again*, "*u* the Law and Commandments were given "us to no other end, but "that we ſhould be damn'd "by them; inaſmuch, that "it is impoſſible for Us to "do what they Command. The ſame Doctrine is taught by *Luther*, in ſeveral places of his Works, by *Willet* x and by our Brethren the *Gomariſts* of *Holland*, and many of our *French Synods* Believe which you pleaſe, both Doctrines are of the *Reformation*. It is alſo the Doctrine of *Luther* and *Calvin*, that God does not caſt Men into Hell becauſe their ſins deſerve it, nor ſave Men becauſe they merit it, but meerly becauſe he will have it ſo: "He crowns thoſe who have not deſerved it; ſays *Luther*, y "and he puniſhes thoſe who "have not deſerved it; 'tis Gods Wrath and "Severity to damn the one, 'tis Gods Grace "and Mercy to ſave the other. *Calvin* alſo, "z Men are damn'd for no other cauſe, but "becauſe God will have it ſo; he is the cauſe "and Author of their Damnation; their "Damnation is decreed by God when they "are in their Mothers Womb, becauſe he "will have it ſo; this is alſo the belief of

t *Lib.* 2. *Inſtit. c.* 7. 5. u *Harm. Evang. in Luc. c.* 10. *verſe* 26. x *In Synop. Papiſmi* pag. 564. y *Lib. de Servo. Arbit. cont. Eraſm.* 2 *Lib.* 3. *Inſt. c.* 21. *ſect.* 5. & 7. &c. 22. *ſect.* 11. & *cap.* 13. 1.

our *Gomariſts* in *Holland*, of many *French* Churches, and of ſeveral learned *Calviniſts*; though the Church of *England* denies this Doctrine, none will dare ſay it is not the Doctrine of the Reformation, becauſe it is Scripture as Interpreted by ſuch eminent men of our Church.

The Church of *England* underſtands by Scripture, that God is not the Author nor cauſe of ſin, that does not force us to ſin; who doubts but that this is therefore the Doctrine of the Reformation? But *Calvin*, *Brentius*, *Beza*, and ſeveral others underſtand by Scripture, that God is the cauſe and Author which forces our Will to Sin; That Man, and the Devil, are but Gods Inſtruments to commit it: That Murthers, Inceſts, Blaſphemies, *&c.* are the Works of God, that he makes us commit them: And who doubts but this alſo is the Doctrine of the Reformation, being Scripture, as Interpreted by ſuch eminent and ſound judgement? "God "*ſays* Calvin,[a] directs, moves, "inclines and forces the Will "of man to ſin; inſomuch "that the power and efficacy "of Working, is wholly in "him; Man, nay, and Satan "when he impells us, being "only Gods Inſtruments "which he uſes to make "us ſin. *Zuinglius*, *Willet*, *Beza*, teach the ſame.

a *Lib. 2. Inſt. c. 4 ſect. 3. & lib. 1. c. 18. ſect. 2. & lib. c. 23. ſect. 4. Lo: 1. de deprovid. c. 6. in Synopſ. pag. 563. In manifeſt. ſtrating. Papiſt.*

The

The Church of *England* has Scripture for her Rule of Faith, and gives us the liberty to Interpret, Underſtand, and Believe *ſome Text* of it, as each one thinks beſt; and ſo permits *Presbyterians* to deny *Epiſcopacy*, *Lutherans* to deny *Figurative Preſence*, &c. and confeſſes they are all her Brethren of the Reformation, but ſhe will give no liberty at all to Interpret *other Texts*, but all muſt underſtand them as ſhe does, or all muſt be *Hereticks* and damn'd Men? No, that Text *My Father and I are one*, muſt be Interpreted to ſignifie the Unity and Nature of the Father and Son, as the Church of *England* believes, none muſt interpret it otherwiſe: So that the difference betwixt the *Popiſh* Church and that of *England*, is, the firſt gives us no Liberty at all, the ſecond gives us ſome Liberty, the firſt robs us of all; the ſecond but of one half. The Rule of Faith in *Popery* is Scripture as Interpreted by the *Pope* and *Councils*; the Rule of Faith in the Church of *England*; as to *ſome Articles* is Scripture as Interpreted by the Church of *England*; and as to *other Articles*, Scripture as each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands it, and thus *Proteſtants* are but half *Papiſts*, and half *Reformed*.

Let any unbyaſs'd and impartial man judge if the Church of *England* proceeds juſtly in this: For if our Rule of Faith be Scripture, as each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands it, and if as the whole Reformation

believe

believes, we are not to be conſtrained, to believe any Church, Council, or mans ſenſe of Scripture, if we do not judge by the Word of God it's true, by what Authority, Rule, or Reaſon, can the Church of *England* give me Liberty to underſtand and believe *ſome Texts* as I pleaſe, and deny me Liberty to underſtand and believe *others*, as I judge by Scripture they ought to be underſtood? I pray obſerve well this Diſcourſe; here are *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Zuinglius*, and our other firſt Reformers; they Interpret ſome Texts againſt the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. They are praiſed for the firſt, and eſteemed Apoſtolical Reformers, becauſe without any regard of what the Church of *Rome* ſaid, they freely taught and believed what they judged by Scripture to be true; why muſt not they be praiſed and eſteemed true Reformers alſo, for not regarding what the Church of *England* or any other ſays, but teach the impoſſibility of Gods Commandments, the ſufficiency of Faith alone, and all thoſe other *Tenets* which you much millike, ſince they judge by Scripture ſuch to be true Doctrine? Are they bound to ſubmit their judgements to the Church of *England*, more than to that of *Rome*?

The Veneration and uſe of the Sign of the Croſs is flat *Popery* in the judgement of all our Congregations; yet any *Reformed Child* may laudably and piouſly uſe it; inaſmuch as our Common Prayer in the *Adminiſtration of*

Baptiſm,

Baptiſm, Commands the Miniſter to uſe it, ſaying, "We ſign him with the ſign of the "*Croſs*, in token that hereafter he ſhall not "be aſhamed to confeſs the Faith of *Chriſt* "*Crucified*, and manfully to fight nnder his "Banner againſt Sin, the World and the "Devil. And in our Kalender, printed ſince his Majeſties Reſtauration, it is called the *Holy Croſs*.

Our Congregations generally believe, it is *Popery* to keep Holy-days (except the *Sabbath-day*) and *Saints-days*; to Faſt *Lent*, *Vigils* commanded, *Ember-days* and *Fridays*; and yet all this is recommended to us in our *Common-Prayer-Book*, and the Miniſter is commanded in the *Adminiſtration of the Lords Supper*, to publiſh the Holy-days of the Week, and exhort us to Faſt; and ſurely, he is not commanded to teach, or exhort us to any thing, but the Doctrine of the Reformation: It is true, the Students of our *Colledges* of *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, are much troubled with ſcruples in this point: theſe *Pauperes de Lugduno*, are compelled to faſt all *Fridays* throughout the year; and it is not hunger that makes them complain, but tenderneſs of Conſcience, becauſe they fear it is *Popery*.

It is a *Popiſh* Errour, we ſay to believe that *Pennance*, or other penal Works of Faſting, Almſdeeds or corporal Auſterities, can avail and help for the Remiſſion of our Sins, and ſatisfying Gods Juſtice: No, we ſay,

Penal

Penal Works ſerve for nothing, all is done by *Repentance*; that's to ſay, by ſorrow of Heart for having offended God. This is the Doctrine of *Daneus*, *Willet*, *Junius* and *Calvin*, who ſay *Francis*, *Dominick*, *Bernard*, *Anthony*, and the reſt of the Popiſh *Monks* and *Fryars* are in Hell for their Auſterities and Penal Works for all that, you may very well believe; and it's the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*, that *Pennance* and Penal Works do avail for the Remiſſion of our ſin, and are very profitable to the Soul; for, our *Common-Prayer-Book* in the *Commination againſt ſinners*, ſays thus, *In the Primitive Church, there was a Godly Diſcipline, that at the beginning of Lent, ſuch as were notorious ſinners, were put to open Pennance, and puniſh'd in this World, that their Souls may be ſaved in the day of the Lord.* And our *Common-Prayer* Books wiſhes that this Diſcipline were reſtored again; and ſurely it does not wiſh that *Popery* were reſtored; therefore it is no *Popery* to ſay that *Pennance*, or Penal Works, do ſatisfie for our ſins in this World, and avail to ſave us in the other.

I know many much miſlike our *Common-Prayer* Book, for theſe *Popiſh*-Tenets; but what do you ſay of the grand Errours of *Popery*? can a man be a true Child of the *Reformation*, and yet believe the *Popes Supremacy*? deny the *Kings Supremacy*; believe *Tranſubſtantiation* and *Communion in one kind*; are

are these Tenets the Doctrine of the Reformation, or consistent with its principles?

The *Kings Supremacy* is undoubtedly the Doctrine of the Reformation, because it is judged by the Church of *England* to be of Scripture, yet only the *Quakers*, *Presbyterians*, *Anabaptists*, and other Congregations judge it is not of Scripture, but as Erroneous a Tenet as that of the *Popes* Supremacy; *Calvin* 6. *Amos*, says, *They were unadvised people, and Blasphemers, who raised King* Henry *the* VIII. *so far as to call him the head of the Church*; but also that no Civil Magistrate can be the head of any particular Church, the Doctrine of the *Centuriists*, *cent. sept.* pag. 11. of *Cartwright*, *Viret*, *Kemnitus*, and many others; who doubts then but that in the principles and Doctrine of the Reformation, you may deny the Kings Supremacy, though the Church of *England* believes it. The *Popes* Supremacy is the Doctrine of *Popery*, who doubts it? but it is also the Doctrine of the Reformation, for many of our eminent Doctors have judged it to be the Doctrine of Scripture, as *Whitgift* [a] who cites *Calvin* and *Musculus* for this opinion; but it is needful we relate some of their expres words, "I do not deny, "says Luther, [b] but the Bishop "of *Rome*, is, has been, and ought to be first "of all; I believe he is above all other "Bishops, it is not lawful to deny his Supremacy,

[a] *In Defens.* &c. *pag.* 373. 70. & 395. [b] *In Respons. tredecem.*

" premacy: *Melanchthon* c *says no leſs*, that " the Biſhop of *Rome* is above all the Church, " that it is his Office to go- " vern, to judge in contro- " verſies, to watch over the " Prieſts, to keep all Nations " in conformity and unity of " Doctrine: *Somaize*, d The " Pope of *Rome* has been " without controverſie the firſt Metropolitan " in *Italy*, and not only in *Italy*, nor only in " the *Weſt*, but in all the World, the other " Metropolitans have been chief in their re- " ſpective diſtricts, but the Pope of *Rome* " has been Metropolitan and Primate, not " only of ſome particular Dioceſs, but of " all, *Grotius* has expreſly the ſame Doctrin, and proves this Supremacy belongs to the Pope *Jure Divino*. I pray conſider if theſe Doctors be not Men of ſound judgement, and eminent learning and credit in our Reformation, and if our Doctrine be Scripture as ſuch men underſtand it.

Propoſ. c *In Epiſt. ad* Card. *Bellay Epiſc. Pariſienſ.*
d *In Tract. Euchar. ad. p. Sarmun m.*

As for *Tranſubſtantiation*, it contrins two difficulties; firſt, if the *Body* of *Chriſt* be really in the *Sacrament*; and this *Real Preſence*, the *Lutherans* defend to be the Doctrine of Scripture, as well as the *Papiſts*, why then ſhould it be called *Popiſh* more than Reformed Doctrine? The ſecond is, if the ſubſtance of *Bread* be in

e *In Annot. ſuper Novum Teſtam. cap.* 10. *Matth.* & *ſæpe alibi* (To. Edit. *Jonah. l. de cap. Babyl.*

in the *Sacrament* together with *Christ's Body*? *Lutherans* say it is, *Papists* say it is not, but that there is a *Transsubstantiation*, or change of the whole substance of *Bread*, into the *Body* of *Christ*; but hear what *Luther* [f] says of this that we call *Popish* Doctrine "I give "all Persons liberty to believe in this point, "what they please, without hazard of their "Salvation, either that the Bread is in the "*Sacrament* of the Altar, or that it is not? would *Luther* have given this Liberty if *Transsubstantiation* had not been the Doctrine of Reformation as well as any other.

Communion in one kind, is the Doctrine of the Reformation, no less than Communion in both; for besides that *Luther* says, [g] "They sin not against Christ who use one "kind only, seeing Christ has not comman-"ded to use both; *and again*, [h] though it "were an excellent thing to use both kinds "in the *Sacrament*; and Christ has com-"manded nothing in this as necessary, yet "it were better to follow peace and unity, "than to contest about the "kinds, but also *Melancthon* [i] who in the opinion of *Luther* surpasses all the Fathers of the Church, expresly teaches the same *Doctrine*; and the Church of *England* Statute 1. *Edward* VI. commands, *That the Sacrament be commonly administred in both kinds*,

[g] *Lib. de cap. Babyl. c. de* Euchar. [h] *Epist. ad Bohemos in declarat. Euch. & in serm. de Euch.* [i] *in Concil. Theol. ad March. Elect. de usu utriusque speciei* pag. 141.

if neceſſity does not require otherwiſe; mark, he ſays, but *commonly*, and that for ſome neceſſity it may be received in one; laſtly, the ſufficiency of one kind in the *Sacrament*, is plainly ſet down by our *Reformed* Church of *France*, in her Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, Printed at *Saumur*, Chap. 12. Art. 7. *The Miniſter muſt give the Bread in the Supper to them, who cannot drink the Cup, provided it be not for contempt.* And the reaſon is becauſe there are many who cannot endure to taſt the Wine; wherefore it often happens among them, that ſome perſons do take the *Bread* alone.

Now you may admire the injuſtice of the Papiſts in condemning our *Reformed Doctrine* and *Doctors* as *Heretick*s, whereas thoſe Tenets are believed by many of us, as well as them; and the groundleſs ſeverity of our Congregations in exclaming againſt that Doctrin; it being the Doctrin of the Reformation, whereas ſo many eminent men of our own, judge it to be of Scripture.

For to know certainly if a *Doctrine* be of the *Reformation*, you muſt try it by our *Teſt* or Rule of Faith, which is the written Word of God, and whatever any man of ſound judgement, of a ſincere and humble Heart judges to be contained in Scripture, or an indubitable conſequence out of it; that Man may believe that *Doctrine*, let all others judge of it as they liſt, and by ſo believing, will be a true Child of the Reformation; wherefore,

wherefore, ſince that the Church of *France*, that of *England* in *Edward* the VI's. time, *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Grotius*, and other Authors do judge *Tranſubſtantiation*, Popes Supremacy, and Communion in one kind to be the *Doctrine* of Scripture; we muſt call it the Doctrine of the Reformation; and if you judge as they did, you may believe the *Doctrin* and be ſtill of the Reformation, as well as they.

Can you ſhew me any other Tenet of Popery, which you can call the *Doctrine* of the Reformation?

You can hardly ſhew me any Tenet of *Popery*, but what is it's *Doctrine*; what *Doctrine* more *Popiſh* than that of *Confeſſion* and *Abſolution* from Sins? yet it is as truly the *Doctrine* of the Reformation, as *Figurative Preſence*: for not only k *Lobechius*, l *Altamerus*, m *Saecerius*, and n *Melancthon* ſays, *it's a Sacrament*; but the Church of *England* in our *Common Prayer* Book, declares that *Prieſts* have not only the power of declaring their Sins to be forgiven to their *Penitents*, but alſo the power of forgiving them; and ſets down the form of *Abſolution* which the Miniſter is to uſe, "Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who left power "to the Church to Abſolve all Sinners which "truly Repent, of his Mercy forgive thee "and

k *In Diſput. Theol.* pag. 301. l *In Cocilliat. loc. Scrip. loce.* 191. m *In locis Commun. To.* 1 *de poteſt. Eccl.* n *In Apol. Confeſ. Aug. art.* 13. & *lib.* pag. 234.

"and thine offences; and I by his Authority "committed unto me, do Abſolve thee from "all thy Sins: The Miniſters of the Dioceſs of *Lincoln* in their *Survey of the Book of Common Prayers*, checkt this *Doctrine* as Popery, and petitioned to have it blotted out, but could not prevail; whereby we are given to underſtand, it's the *Doctrine* of the *Reformation*.

It is *Popery*, we ſay to call extream Unction, Confirmation, and Holy Order of Prieſthood, Sacraments; and who can juſtly deny all this to be the Doctrine of the Reformation? for o *Calvin* ſays, "I confeſs, the Diſ-"ciples of Chriſt did uſe Extream Unction as "a Sacrament; I am not, *ſays he*, of the "opinion of thoſe, who judge it was only a "Medicine for corporal diſeaſes: *Calvin* p alſo, and with him our *Common Prayer* Book and all our Divines ſay, a Sacrament is nothing elſe, but a Viſible Sign of the inviſible Grace we receive by it; and they ſay with q *Couel*, r *Hooker*, and others, that this definition fits exactly Confirmation, wherefore the Miniſters of the Dioceſs of *Lincoln* checkt the *Common-Prayer* Book for giving the Definition of a *Sacrament* to Confirmation. s *Melancthon*, t *Bilſon*, u *Hooker*, and x *Calvin* expreſly teach, that the Order of Prieſthood is a Sacrament.

o *In p. 5. Epiſt. Jac. v. 4.* p *Lib. 4. Inſt. c. 14. Inſt. c. 14. ſect. 5.* q *In modeſt. Examin.* r *In Eccl. Polit. c. 5. ſect. 66.* s *In locis Commun. tit. de Numero. Sa-*

Sacrament. And when Men of so eminent Judgement of our Reformation teach this to be the Doctrine of Scripture, who doubts but that it is of the Reformation.

cram.t In perpet. Regem. pag. 109.
u *In Eccl polit. lib.* 5. *sect.* 77.
x *lib.* 4. *Inst. c.* 20.

By this, you destroy the Doctrine of the Reformation of two Sacraments only.

Destroy it? God forbid: Because the Church of *England* says, there are but two Sacraments, I say it is the *Doctrine* of the Reformation, there are but two, and because so many eminent Men judge by Scripture there are more, I say it is the Doctrine of the Reformation there are more, that's to say six, *Baptism*, *Confirmation*, *Eucharist*, *Pennance*, *Extream Unction* and *Holy Order*: and very likely our Bishops and Ministers, for their Wives sake, will not stick to grant that Matrimony also is a Sacrament.

But can you say, that *Prayers to Saints and Images*, *Prayer for the Dead*, and *Purgatory* are not meer Popery, and in no wise the Doctrine of Reformation.

Without doubt, these Tenets are Popery, but all the World knows the *Lutherans* use Images in their Churches, and pray before them; and the holy Synod of *Charenton* has declared, that the *Lutherans* have nothing of

Superſtition or Idolatry in their manner of Divine Worſhip; this is alſo the Doctrine *y* of *Jacobus Andreas*, z *Brachmanus*, a *Kemnitius*, *Luther* and *Brentius* quoted by *Beza*, *a* and why ſhould not a Doctrine, judged by ſuch eminent Men to be of Scripture, be called the Doctrine of the Reformation? *Prayers for the Dead* and *Purgatory* is *Popery* confeſſedly; but alas! it is taught expreſly by *Urbanius Regius*, d *Bucer*, e *Zuinglius*, f *Melancthon*, g *Luther*, h the *Common-Prayer* Book in King *Edward's* time Printed 1549. and many others of our Learned Doctors, and what can you call more properly the Doctrine of the Reformation, than what ſuch Men teach to be the Doctrine of Scripture? And though our Brethren, *Quakers*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Presbyterians*, and *Proteſtants*, judge Prayers to *Angels* and *Saints* to be nothing elſe but *Popery*; yet our *Common Prayer* Book has the ſame Collect or Prayer to *Angels* in St. *Michael's* day, that the Popiſh *Maſs-Book* has, and deſires that the Angels *may ſuccour and defend us on Earth*; and Prayers to, and Interceſſion of *Saints* is taught

y *Epit. Colloq. Montisbel.* z *In Centaur. Exercit. Theol.* pag. 270. a *Exampar.* 4. b *Inreſpond. ad acta Colloq. Montisbel. par.* 2. *in Preſaſ.* c *In locis Commun. c.* 18. & 19.

d *Inſcrip. Angl.* pag. 450. e *To.* 1. *in Eupian. Art.* 90. & *Art.* 60. f *In Apolog. Confeſs Aug.* g *To.* 1. *Wittem. in reſol. de* h *Indul. concl.* 15. i *Epiſt. ad Spalat.* k *Acts & Mon.* pag. 462 & 312. l *To. Germ. fol.* 214. m *De formula Miſſa & To.* 3. *Germ.*

taught by *Luther*, i *Bilney*, and *Latimer* quoted by *Fox*, k and consequently it is the Doctrine of the Reformation.

Listen to our Apostolical and Divine *Luther*: l "If a General Council, *says he*, did "permit *Priests* to Marry, it would be a "a singular mark of Piety, and sign of God-"liness, in that case to take Concubines, "rather than to Marry in conformity to the "Decree of the Council, I would in that "case command Priests not to Marry under pain of Damnation. *And again he says*, m" If "the Council decree Communion in both "kinds; in contempt of the Council, "I would take one only or none. See these words of *Luther* quoted by our learned *Hospinian*, n and *Jewel* o and see it is not only my Doctrine but of great *Luther*, that in case the *Pope* and *Councils* deny all the Tenets they now believe; we may, and it will be a pious Godly action to believe them, and make as many Acts of Parliament for them, as now we have against them.

k *In Histor. Sa. part.* 2. *fol.* 13.
l *In replic ad* Hardingum.

This is an evident sequel out of that Principle, and whereas there is not one Tenet of all those which I rehearsed, whether they concern *Doctrin* or Manners; but was judged by the Doctors, which I cited for it, to be the *Doctrine* of Scripture; it follows unavoidably, that there is not one Tenet of them but is the *Doctrine* of the Reformation: Therefore

Therefore you muſt be forced to either of theſe two; either to ſay that our Rule of Faith, by which ſuch *Doctrines* are wairanted, is naught, wicked and ſcandalous of all thoſe I rehearſed; you cannot deny, but that it was taugt by the Author I quoted for it, and judged by him to be the *Doctrin* of Scripture. And if no *Doctor* hitherto had believed, you, or I, or ſome other perſon of ſound judgement, may judge it to be the *Doctrine* of Scripture; either of both, then you muſt be conſtrained to grant. Or that the *Doctrine* of the Reformation, is not what each perſon of ſound judgement underſtands to be the *doctrine* and ſenſe of Scripture, which is as much as to ſay, that our Rule of Faith muſt not be Scripture as we underſtand it, but that we muſt believe againſt our Judgement and Conſcience, what others ſay is the *doctrine* and ſenſe of Scripture: Or you muſt grant that all and each of thoſe Tenets I rehearſed, is the *doctrine* of the Reformation, though you, or this or that Man may judge them to be blaſphemies and ſcandals.

I confeſs our Rule of Faith in the Reformation is Scripture as each perſon underſtands it; for all our Reformed Churches do gives us this Rule of Faith.

And in caſe the Church of *England*, *France*, or *Germany*, judge a *doctrine* to be blaſphemous and againſt Scripture, and *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or I, or another, judge it is good *doctrine* and conformable to Scripture, to which

which judgement muſt I ſtand? Muſt I believe what I judge in my Conſcience to be Scripture, and not what others judge, if they judge the contrary? When *Luther* began the Reformation, did not almoſt all Chriſtians and the whole Church believe *Purgatory* and *Prayers* to *Saints* to be the *doctrine* of Scripture? And did not he very commendably deny it againſt them all, becauſe he judged by Scripture it was not? Will a *Presbyterian* believe Epiſcopacy, becauſe the Church of *England* ſays it is the *doctrine* of Scripture? No, but deny it becauſe himſelf judges It is not.

For let a Man be ever ſo leared and Godly; if he gives an Interptetation of Scripture which is denied by all the Church, he muſt not be followed.

Since when is it commendable to conſtrain Mens Judgements to believe, not what each one thinks beſt, but what the Church thinks may be ſafely believed? Was this Commenble in the beginning of our Reformation, when our bleſſed Reformers began to teach their private Judgements againſt the Church then eſtabliſh'd? If it was, then the Church of *Rome* is to be commended, for perſecuting and Excommunicating our firſt Reformers; and if this was not, nor is not commendable in the Church of *Rome*, why is it commendable in the Church of *England*? This is a piece of *Popery*, whereof the Church of *England* is guilty, and for which all our Congregations are jealous of her.

I confeſs other Congregations will admit no ſuch Curb, or Bridle on their Judgements, but follow Scripture as they underſtood it; but the Church of *England* has a reverent regard for the ſenſe and Interpretation of it given by Primitive Ages, Fathers and Councils, and that we prefer before the private Interpretations of particular Perſons.

The Senſe and Interpretation of primitive *Ages*, *Church* and *Fathers* muſt be preferred before the Interpretation of any private perſon, or Congregation, and what think you of our whole Reformation, which allowes no other Rule of Faith, but *Scripture as each perſon of ſound Judgement underſtands it*? What ſay you of *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and the reſt of our Reformers, who preferred their own private ſenſe and Interpretation of Scripture, before that of the whole Church? What ſay you to the *Presbyterians*, who prefer their own ſenſe and Interpretation of the *Bible* before that of the Church of *England*? I grant, there ought to be a reſpect for the judgement and Interpretation of the Text, given by the *Primitive Church* and *Fathers*; but if a *Doctor* or a Man of ſound Judgement, repleniſht with Gods Spirit, read Scripture with an humble Heart, and pure Intention, and judges by it that Bigamy is lawful; that there is no Myſtery of three perſons in one divine Nature; or that Chriſt deſpaired on the Croſs, *&c.* Tho'

theſe

theſe *doctrines* be quite againſt the Judgments of *Fathers*, *Church*, and *Councils*, he may believe them, and be ſtill a true Reformed Child, becauſe he follows our Rule of Faith; if he muſt deny theſe Articles, becauſe others decry them; then he muſt go againſt his own Judgement and Conſcience, for to conform himſelf to them, and his Rule of Faith muſt not be Scripture as each Man of ſound judgement underſtands it; but as the *Primitive Ages*, *Church*, and *Councils* underſtand it; and this is *Popery*.

Is it not generally believed in our Reformation, and moſt ſtrongly proved of late, by that incomparable Wit and Pen-man *Doctor Stillingfleet*, that *Popery* has as much Idolatry as *Paganiſm*: Our Land therefore had in *Paganiſm* as good a Religion as it received by *Auſtin* in *Popery*; does not this our noble Champion, and moſt of the *Scribes* of the Church of *England* teach, That Popery is a *ſaving Religion*, that we may be ſaved in the Church of *Rome*? if Popery, (notwithſtanding it be Idolatry as they ſay) by a ſaving Religion, how can they deny but that *Paganiſm* is alſo a ſaving Religion, what need therefore had our Fore-fathers to abandon *Paganiſm*? why was it not left in the Land?

If *England* had been as well informed of the merit of Paganiſm, when firſt *Chriſtianity* was Preached, it had never exchanged the one Idolatry for the other.

Dr

Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Charge againſt the Church of* Rome, pag. 40. and 41. ſays plainly, *That the* Pagans *are charged with more than they are guilty of*; pag, 7. ſays that *Jupiter* adored by the Pagans; *was ſo far from being an Arch-devil, in the opinion of St.* Paul, *that he was the true God, Bleſſed for evermore:* that the Pagans adored but one Supream and Omnipotent God, which they called *Jupiter*, and which they did believe to be neither a Devil nor a Man, but a true, and the firſt and chiefeſt of the Gods; and that the reſt of the Gods which they adored, they looked upon them as *Inferiour deities*, and gave them no other Adoration.

Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and Dr. *Burnet*, and other Reformed Writers prove convincingly; as to their Sentiment, that Paganiſm is no more Idolatry than Popery, and that Paganiſm having been baniſh'd out of our Land upon the falſe Information of our firſt Teachers, that it was an Adoration of Devils, or evil Spirits, and wicked debaucht Men, who by counterfeit Wonders, and Cheats, gained the peoples Adoration; ſince that Dr. *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Burnet*, and other Reformed Writers will make it out, that the Pagans Adored no Devils, but *One true, Omnipotent, Supream God, bleſſed for ever more*, which they called *Jupiter*, and the reſt of the Gods as Inferiour Deities, as Papiſts do their Saints, and will prove that the Pagans were charged by the firſt D. Doctors of Chriſtanity, and

by

by all our Anceſtors, with more than they are guilty of; why ſhould not Paganiſm be reſtored again to the Land, and heard to ſpeak for it ſelf, and Dr. *Stillingfleet* and his zealous companions be Licenc'd to plead for them, and for holy *Jupiter*, ſo foully miſ-repreſented by Antiquity, as to be believed an Arch-Devil, whom Dr. *Stillingfleet* will prove to have been *a true bleſſed God for evermore*?

That Paganiſm was ſo unjuſtly baniſh'd from our Nation, if what Dr. *Stillidgfleet* ſays, be true, he is a learned, Religious, and diligent ſearcher into Scripture; the Ancient D. Drs. and Fathers of the Church reading Scripture, judged and taught, that *Jupiter* was a Devil, as well as the reſt of the Gods which the *Gentiles* Adored; Dr. *Stillingfleet* and other Reformed D. Doctors reading Scripture, judge he was no Devil, but *the true God bleſſed for evermore*; any Child of the Reformation may believe either of both, and put *Jupiter* into our *Litanies*, as well as JESUS Chriſt; and offer Sacrifice to him as formerly our Anceſtors did; for whatever any Man of ſound judgement judges to be the Doctrine of Scripture, may be ſafely believed, and is the Doctrine of the Reformation.

Here

Here follows the Senſe of Scripture *as Interpreted by the* Church, Councils, *and* Fathers, *in lieu of thoſe fond fancies which the* Proteſtant Preachers *have poſſeſt the people with, as the belief of* Catholicks, *faithfully reported from a true zeal and affection to my Country-men, that they may not plead Ignorance before the Tribunal of the Almighty, in ſo important a concern as their Salvation, to the manifeſt hazard of their Souls Eternity.*

THe *Catholicks* teaches Pennance, Mortification of the Body, ſubjection of the Fleſh to the Spirit, the ſenſitive part to the rational, by Praying, Faſting, Obedience, Humility, Poverty, Pardoning, Injuries, loving one another, Praying for Enemies, doing good to thoſe that Perſecute us, ſuffering Perſecution for Conſcience ſake, making Vows of Chaſtity, leaving the World, our friends and poſſeſſions, to *Conſecrate* our ſelves by Prayer and

To Crucifie *the Fleſh and the* Luſts *thereof.* Gal. 5. 12. *Forſake all and follow* Chriſt. *Mat.* 19. 22. *And out of the ſame* Chap. v. 27, 28, 29. *By Vow-*

and the ſervice of God, to keep *Lent* and faſting days, to obſerve Religious Vows, to ſell all we have and give it to the Poor, to take up our Croſs and follow Chriſt, to leave Father, Mother, Brothers, Siſters, and Wife, and all things for the love of God; *in fine*, that there is no way to Heaven, but by the way of *Penance*, *Faſting*, and *Prayer* and ſuch like Mortifications and Auſterities of the Body, to make Reſtution of ill-gotten goods, and Reparation for any Violations of anothers good Name or Reputation, to feed the Hungry, give drink to the Thirſty, Cloath the Naked, Redeem the Captives, Harbour the Harbourleſs, Viſit the Sick, Bury the Dead, to Correct the Obdurate, Inſtruct the Ignorant, Reduce the Wavering, Comfort the Sorrowful, bear wrongs patiently, forgive all Injuries, and to pray for the Living and the Dead, as alſo, that God ſhuts the Gate of Heaven againſt the Impenitent, and that there is no Salvation without Charity, but that Charity it ſelf covers a Multitude of Sins, that Charity gives Spiritual Life to the Soul, that in Charity we know we are Tranſlated from Death to Life, becauſe we love the Brethren, *That the good*

ing perpetual Chaſtity, St. Mat. 19. 12.
St. Mat. 15. 15. 25.
Tobit. 12.
Tobit 1.
Iſai 58.
St. James 5.
St. Matt. 18.
Galib.
Prov. 27.
Eccleſ. 5.
Rom. 15.
St. Mark. 11.
St. James 2. 26.
St. John 4. 16. 3. v. 14.
James 5. 20.
1 St. John 3. 14.

Paſtor giveth his life for his Sheep, St. John 10. 12. *As that Faith without Charity is dead*, St. James 2. 26. And that the higheſt act of Charity, is to give our Life for Gods Honour and the Salvation of our Neighbour; theſe ways are not pleaſing to the people, nor eaſie to Fleſh and Blood without Gods Grace. If *Proteſtants* and *Reformers* go to Heaven with more liberty, and with greater eaſe and pleaſure, we muſt ſay, broad is the way, and many there be that find it. But if there be no Salvation without following the above-cited Doctrines as the *Catholick Church* teaches, the *Catholick* is much nearer than the *Proteſtant* to the ſtrait way and narrow Gate that leads and opens to Eternal Life.

There are no Doctrines mentioned here, but what are contained in the Catechiſms of all *Roman Catholicks*, and that which they teach all Children, and which are very wide from thoſe Doctrines that *Proteſtant* Preachers report of them about Diſpenſations, with Allegiance, Oaths, and all other Tyes, how ſolemnly ſacred ſoever; all which are no leſs commonly than untruly ſuggeſted; for I ſhall demand of ſuch, by what Councils received by the *Catholick Church*, ſuch Diſpenſations have been allowed, or from what Church Tradition ſuch pernicious Tenents have been handed, (I deſire of *Proteſtants* to produce one) for if it be any point of Faith, it muſt have taken riſe either from the Authority of ſome Council received in the Church,

or

or of Universal Tradition, since whatever obliges all *Roman Catholicks*, must of necessity enter into their belief or practice at one of these two doors. And if these Dispensations have been taught neither by Councils nor Traditions, it remains that *Protestants* have been gull'd by their Pastors in receiving such for *Catholick Doctrines*; which are taught no where but in *Protestant Books* and *Pulpits*: For had such *Dispensations* been the *Doctrines* or Practices of *Papists*, what folly had it appeared in *Protestant* Magistrates to require Oaths of them, who hold themselves under no obligation to them when they have taken them, and what madness had it appeared in *Papists*, to incur the Forfeiture heretofore of their lives, and late of their liberty and fortunes, rather then *take such Oaths*, with which (if they had advised with the *Protestant* Ministers) they might have dispensed at pleasure.

Country-men, read your Chronicles, peruse your Statutes and Records, review many of your Ancient Customs and Observances, look upon the Windows of the Churches, reflect upon the Names and Dedications of the same Churches, of divers days of the year, of divers of your Colledges, upon the Crosses every where erected; upon the Multitude of Monasteries, Abbies, and other Religious Houses, which heretofore flourished in this Kingdom, and then suffer your selves to doubt, if you can, whether your noble

Progenitors, almoſt for the ſpace of a Thouſand years were zealous *Papiſts*: Caſt your eyes then upon their Wiſdom, known by the Government, and Laws which they eſtabliſhed: Upon their Piety; blazon'd by the goodly Churches, by the ſtately Monaſteries, by the renowned Colledges, which they Erected and Endowed; and cenſure them not to have been ſo ſtupid, ſo ungodly, that with ſo great zeal and coſts, they would have embraced, honoured, and eſtabliſhed Papiſtry; had it been ſo abſurd, ſo ungrounded, ſo Superſtitious and Idolatrous, and ſo dangerous to Princes and their States, as divers of your deceived or deceiving Teachers do give you to underſtand. Neither think your Neighbours, who live *Papiſts* amongſt you, ſo blockiſh, that they would forſake the eaſie and fleſh-pleaſing Religion of *Luther*, *Calvin*, and other new Teachers, to embrace, with ſo great loſs and hazards, the auſtere Profeſſion of *Papiſts*; if the ſame were ſuch, as you are made to believe.

Let not therefore any prejudicate conceits defraud you of this fit opportunity, to free your ſelves from the moſt dangerous miſtakes, and conſequently from the fruitleſs pangs of too late Repentance, wherewith every one will be fearfully afflicted, that departs this life culpably, in a wrong and falſe Religion; when the judging light of Chriſt ſhall lay open to him how naked he is, (through his own willfull negligence) of Divine Faith, of

Heavenly

Heavenly Charity, and of other Cœleſtial Vertues, abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.

Becauſe divers *Proteſtant* Teachers endeavour to make their followers believe, that the Fathers of the *Primitive Church* were *Proteſtants*, *(which Followers know no otherwiſe,)* but let them take notice, that thoſe Ancient Worthies, and Lights of the Church of Chriſt, were either Monks, or Founders of *Monaſtical Diſcipline*; or at leaſt, Approvers and Praiſers of the ſame; St. *Anthony* was a *Monk*, and St. *Athanaſius* his *Praiſer*; St. *Baſil* the Great, a *Monk*, and the Founder of a Monaſtical Inſtitute, which in the Eaſtern part of the World is yet practiſed: St. *Gregory* the Divine, was a *Monk*; St. *Chriſoſtom*, a *Monk*; St. *Hierom*, a *Monk*; the Great St. *Auguſtine*, the Founder of a *Monaſtical courſe of Life*; St. *Martin*, a *Monk*; St. *Benedict*, a *Monk*, and Founder of the famous Order of *Monks*, which does yet flouriſh in the *Weſtern Church*; St. *Gregory* the Great was a *Monk*, and by the labours of Forty Monks, did firſt plant *Chriſtianity* amongſt the *Engliſh*. Let any Man judge how likely, or how true it is, that theſe Men were *Proteſtants*.

Secondly, take notice, that theſe ancient, and moſt Learned *Fathers* were great Praiſers, Practiſers of Auſtere and Penitential Works, conſiſting in frequent Prayer, in much Watching, in ſevere Faſting, in hard Lodgings, in courſe and ſpare Dyet, in wearing of Hair-

Cloath, and the like; they lived ſingle lives, many of them beſtowed their Wealth upon the Poor, and other Pious Uſes, and profeſſed voluntary Poverty, following therein the Counſel of Chriſt, given *Matth*, 19. 21. and they not only allowed of, but alſo moſt highly extolled the obſerving of perpetual Chaſtity, and Virginity, preferring the ſame far above Matrimony. Were not theſe men then ſtrange *Proteſtants*.

Thirdly, take notice, that theſe Ancient Worthies, even by the Confeſſion of all *Proteſtants*, were men of accute Wits, of excellent Learning: If then they had found in the *Word of God* (as *Proteſtants* ſay they find) that only *Faith* does juſtifie; that *good Works* are not *Meritorious*: That in Works of *Grace* men have not *Free-will*: That they are not able to keep the *Commandments*: That it is not in the power of man or woman to live perpetually Chaſte; that Virginity is not more pleaſing to God than *Matrimony*; that to give all to the Poor, to Faſt, Pray, and watch much, and to undergo other Auſterities, and Mortifications of the Body, doth not profit and enrich the Soul; that there is no *Purgatory*, no *Pennance* to be done, no ſatisfaction to be made for Sin, no puniſhment to be inflicted upon the Faithful for them, after this Life.

If, I ſay, the Ancient Fathers had found theſe, and the like *Doctrines* of *Proteſtants* in the *Scriptures*, (and why ſhould they not have

have found them there, if there they had been, they being ſo wiſe, ſo learned, and ſo induſtrious ſearchers of the Word of God, as they were?) If there, I ſay, they had found theſe things, and had believed them as *Proteſtants* do, they would have lived as *Proteſtants do*; for why ſhould they not?

If theſe pleaſing *Doctrines*, which are light and eaſie to fleſh and blood, and the ſweet liberty of the new Goſpel, has as feelingly pierced, and as ſtrongly poſſeſſed the Hearts of thoſe Ancients, as it did, and doth the Breaſts and Bowels of *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Bucer*, *Peter Martyr*, *Beza*, and their followers, the Teachers of the *Proteſtant Religion*; they would, without all doubt, with theſe, have preferred Pleaſures before *Pennance*; Feaſting, before *Faſting*; the delights of the Conjugal Life, before the *continent* and *ſingle*; and in a word, Riches, Honours, Pleaſures, before *Labours and ſmart of a Penitential and Mortified Life*; before *voluntary Poverty*, and the *vexing Attire* of *Hair-cloth*, or elſe they had been mad; had they believed as moſt *Proteſtants* do, that ſuch exerciſes as theſe are needleſs, fruitleſs, yea, and ſuperſtitious Toys.

But the truth is, that thoſe ancient and ſhining Lamps of Wiſdom and Sanctity, did not believe as *Proteſtants* do, and therefore they liv'd not as they do, for they were otherwiſe inſtructed in the School of Chriſt; they read, and learned another Leſſon in his Divine Goſpel, even the ſame that *Papiſts* now

do, and therefore they instituted their Lives, as they did; and were in very deed as much *Protestants*, as the *Pope* and His *Priests* and *Fryars* now are, and no more, most certainly; unless we will have them to have been Sots and mad-men.

Let not then, my noble and dear Countrymen, the mis-reports of some of your Teachers, so far prevail with you, as to make you believe (the better to keep and quiet you in *Protestantism*,) that the *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church* were *Protestants*. For certainly, those blessed Servants of Christ were as far from being *Protestants*, as the most zealous of your Teachers are from being *Papists*, yea, from being Monks or Fryars, and from leading their Lives as those Ancients did. If then you truly prize the Learning and Sanctity of the *Primitive Church* and *Christianity*, become of that Belief which their Lives and Practises do preach unto you. If you think them saved, be not so hardy as to seek a new way to Heaven; for the safety of your Souls, is of greater moment, than so to be exposed to hazard, (being there can be but one saving Faith;) Eternal Glory is not easily to be set upon the Dice, when you may take a secure way to it. Become then of the Communion of the Church, in which the *Fathers* lived and died, that therein seconding your belief with a vertuous Life, you may assuredly attain to Everlasting Happiness, beseeching God to prosper your Reading: Considering withal,

withal, That without *Faith in Jesus Christ, no Man can be Saved.* This is not only the Belief of all, that wear and deserve the Noble Title of a *Christian*, but certain also out of the *Word of God. Act.* 4. 12. *There is not Salvation in any other; for neither is there any other Name under Heaven given to Men,* (to wit, but the Name of Jesus,) *wherein we must be saved.* Mark 16. 16. *But he that shall not believe,* (namely, the Gospel and Religion of Christ,) *shall be condemned.* Heb. 11. 6. *Without Faith it is impossible to please God.* Rom. 5. 1. *Being therefore justified by Faith, let us have Peace toward God, by our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access, through Faith, to his Grace.* This Ground then is certain, and cannot be denied by any Christian.

For my second Ground I lay: That this *Faith in Jesus Christ*, which by God's Ordination, is of necessity required to Salvation; is not a meer *Natural Faith*, or *Humane Credulity*; which Men may have by their own natural Forces, without the help of God's special Grace; such as is the Faith of *Heathens*, of *Jews*, and *Turks*; and such indeed, as is the Faith of all *Heretick*s: But it is a Divine, and Supernatural thing, which Men acquire and attain to, by the special Aid of God, by the help of Divine Grace; and therefore this Faith is called, and truly is, *The Gift of God.*

This ground is certain, first out of the Word of God, which clearly teacheth, That

saving

ſaving Faith is the gift of God, Phil. 1. 29. *To you it is given for Chriſt, not only to believe in him, but alſo to ſuffer for him.* Eph. 2. 8. *By Grace you are ſaved through Faith, and that not of your ſelves, for it is the gift of God: Not of Works, that no man may glory.* Joh. 6. 44. *No man can come unto me*, (that is, believe in me; for our firſt ſtep toward Chriſt is Faith,) *unleſs the Father that ſent me draw him.* And Verſe 65. *Therefore did I ſay to you, that no Man can come to me, unleſs it be given him of my Father.* Joh 15. 5. *I am the Vine, you the Branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the ſame bringeth much fruit; for without me, you can do nothing.* Namely, appertaining to Salvation; and therefore not believe, as is requiſite to Life Everlaſting, without the help of Chriſt, that is, of Divine Grace by Chriſt merited, and purchaſed for us. Theſe places are clear.

Secondly, This ground is ſtrongly proved by Reaſon: For the end of Man being to enjoy *Supernatural Glory*, that is the clear Viſion of God, in his bleſſed Kingdom: The means to obtain this high and divine End muſt be ſuitable to it, that is *Divine*, and *Supernatural*. For who will ſay, that Man of himſelf, and by his own forces, without the Aid and ſpecial Favour of God, is able to make himſelf fit, and proportionate, to be aſſociated to the *Saints*, to the *Angels*, to *Chriſt*, to *God*, in Eternal Glory? Who will ſay, that of himſelf, he is able to cleanſe his Soul from the

the ſtains and filth of Sin, and to put upon her a Wedding Garment, a Golden and Reſplendent Veſture, ſuitable to the Banquet and Banqueters of Heaven? The ſpecial Operation then of Divine Grace, muſt Purifie and Embelliſh the Soul of Man, and Attire her in Holy and Divine Vertues, that ſo ſhe may be fit to be the Conſort of God, in the fruition of his Eternal Glory. And ſo *Faith*, which is one of theſe Virtues, and the very Ground and Foundation of the reſt, muſt be *Divine* and *Supernatural*, and ſpring in Man, from the help of God's Grace; and be Adorned and Dignified by it, that ſo there may be a fit proportion betwixt the *Root* and the *Tree*, the *Seed* and the *Fruit*, the *Egg* and the *Bird*, a *Chriſtian Life*, and the *Glory of Heaven*.

Whoſoever will deny this ground, muſt not only forſake the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and go againſt the light of Reaſon, but he muſt alſo fall into the *Pelagian Hereſie*, condemned by the *Church of Chriſt*, Twelve Hundred years ago. Which held, That the Goſpel of Chriſt, being propoſed by his *Preachers*, men of themſelves, without any further help of *Divine Grace*, are able to believe the ſame, and do all therein required to Life Everlaſting. Which proud fancy of *Pelagius*, St. *Hierom*, St. *Auguſtine*, and eſpecially the *Biſhops of Rome*, by the invincible force of God's Word, did cruſh, confound, and beat to the ground.

My

My third Ground is, That as God cannot be the Author of a *Lye*, of a *falſe Doctrine*, of a *falſe Faith*, of a *falſe Religion*: That is, of a *Religion* and *Doctrine* of *Faith*, that is mixed with falſhood, and is partly true, and partly falſe: So he neither doth, neither can ſtir up, and draw Men by his ſpecial Grace, Aid, and Operation, to believe thoſe *Religions*, or *Doctrines* of *Faith*, which are ſo mixed with Falſhood. This ſeems to be evident, even by the light of Reaſon; for as it is the proper work of the Devil, to mix *Religions*, and to pollute them with Falſhood: So it is his continual, and ſtudious endeavour, to ſtir up, and induce Men, (by propoſing ſome pleaſing and delectable thing or other,) to believe and embrace the ſame, that ſo he may deprive them of *Divine Faith*, which is the *Gift of God*, and bring them aſſuredly to Everlaſting Damnation. Neither let any one be ſo ſimple, as to imagine, That the Devil is only the Author of thoſe Religions, which are wholly Falſe.

For ſcarcely is there any *Religion* in the World, that doth teach no Truth at all. And therefore it is ſufficient, to prove a *Religion* to be the work of the Devil, if there be any falſhood in it at all, as St. *Paul* doth ſeem to teach, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. where, foretelling the riſing of the *Manichean Hereſie*, which long did peſter the Church of God, he calls the Doctrine thereof, the *Doctrine of Devils*:

Devils: Notwithſtanding that thoſe *Hereticks*, with ſome falſhoods, did teach many Truths; even as all *Hereticks* do; who, nevertheleſs, are the Inſtruments of the Devil, to ſeduce and deſtroy Souls.

Wherefore, whoſoever do culpably Believe, and follow *Religions*, or *Doctrines* of *Faith*, partly true, partly falſe, do never believe the ſame with *Divine Faith*, which is the *Gift of God*; though they eſteem the *Religion* which they follow, to be the beſt of all others; yea, to be the pure Light of the *Goſpel of Chriſt*: But their *Faith* is ever a meer *Humane Credulity*, ſuch as is the *Faith* of all Miſ-believers, which can never bring them to Eternal Happineſs, how laudably ſoever they live; becauſe without *Divine Faith*, that is, the *Gift of God*, no Man can be ſaved, according to the ſettled Ordination, and Providence of God; as I before have clearly ſhewed out of his Word.

Out of this Doctrine, which is moſt true, doth appear, Firſt, The Reaſon of the Doctrine of of Chriſt, deliver'd *Matt.* 7. where he declares, That falſe *Prophets*, that is, falſe Expounders of the Word of God, in matters of *Faith*, do deſtroy Souls, like as Wolves do deſtroy Sheep; and that it is as impoſſible, that their Followers ſhould acquire, by their teaching, *Divine Faith*, and *True Sanctity*, as it is impoſſible, that Thorns ſhould

ſhould bring out Grapes, or Thiſles, Figgs. The ſame Doctrine is taught by the Apoſtle; who affirms, That *Hereticks* are *ſubverted*, Tit. 3. And *Subvert the Faith of others*, 2 Tim. 2. 18. That they *make Shipwrak about Faith*, 1 Tim. 1. 19. That they *depart from the Faith*, 1 Tim. 4. 1. That they are *Reprobate about Faith*, 2 Tim. 3. 8. and the like. Which miſchief they fall into themſelves, and bring upon their followers, though they Err but in one *Article of Faith*, as *Himenæus* and *Philetus* did, 2 *Tim.* 2. 18.

But Note here, That the Apoſtle in the places cited, doth not mean, that *Heretical Teachers*, do ſo Subvert and Ruine the Faith of their Followers, that they leave them no Faith at all; but that they ſubvert their *Divine Faith*, which is the *Gift of God*, wholly overthrowing that, though they leave them ſtore of Humane Faith; to which ſeduced people firmly ſticking, yea, ſometimes even to Fetters and Death, do reap thereby nothing at all, but *Temporal Commodities*, and Vain glory, purchaſed with the Eternal loſs of their Souls.

Secondly, Doth appear, out of the ſame Doctrine, the great Obligation that *Chriſtian People* have, to keep themſelves within the Boſom of the True and *Catholick Church of Chriſt*: Becauſe that this Church, being *continually aſſiſted by Chriſt himſelf*, Matt. 28.

20.

20. And taught *all Truth by the Holy Ghoſt*, John 16.13. doth propoſe unto her followers, in her Doctrine of Faith, nothing but Truth; whereby their *Faith* doth eaſily come to be *Divine*, and the *Gift of God*, his Heavenly Grace Co-operating with them. It doth alſo appear, how deeply they are obliged to take heed of, and to ſhun, and avoid falſe Prophets; falſe and heretical Expounders of God's Word; which run of their own accord, not being ſent, authorized, or allowed of, by the Ordinary Doctors, and Paſtors, of the Ever Viſible and *Catholick Church of Chriſt*: And how wary they ought to be, not to have itching Ears, after new Maſters, 2 *Tim.* 4. 3. Or greedily to hearken to their Novelties in Matters of Faith; which upon the reckoning, will be found to be no better than Fables, that is, than the Fictitious and Self-inventions of mens brains: Though theſe buſie Teachers palliate them with ſpecious terms, and bear their Hearers in Hand, That theſe their new devices, are the *Pure Light of the Goſpel*. For by forſaking the *Doctrine of the Church*, the Spiritual Mother and Miſtreſs of all Nations; and as the Apoſtle terms her, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *The pillar and Ground of Truth*; and following ſuch *New Teachers*, they make ſhipwrack of their *Divine Faith*, and run themſelves aſſuredly upon the Rock of Perdition.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, It appears how dangerouſly thoſe are deceived, who think they have Faith enough to Salvation, if they believe thoſe Points of the *Chriſtian Religion*, about which *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants* agree; eſteeming themſelves not obliged to believe any of thoſe Articles, about which the Learned of theſe two *Religions* do differ and contend. As though *Chriſtian people* were not obliged, under pain of Damnation, to *beware of falſe Prophets*, Matt. 7. *To ſhun Heretical Teachers*, Tit. 3. *To obey their Lawful Prelates, and to be ſubject unto them*, in matters of Faith and Religion, *Heb.* 13. *To hear thoſe Teachers*, whom Chriſt doth ſend, *Luke* 10. *To hear and obey the Voice of his Church*, if they will not be held to be in as ill caſe, as *Publicans* and *Ethnicks* are, Matth. 18.

Or as though they were not bound to know the right means, by which they are to be Juſtified, cleanſed from Sin, and Saved; to Believe rightly, and to *Receive worthily, the great Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, 1 Cor. 11. Joh. 6. And as though they were not obliged, under the ſame Penalty, to believe and profeſs the True Goſpel, the *True Faith* and *Religion of Chriſt*; and to Serve, and Worſhip God rightly. Seeing thoſe which believe not his Goſpel, that is, the whole Sum of Divine Doctrine, taught by his Apoſtles, and by their Succeſſors, the Ordinary Doctors, and Paſtors of his Church, *are to be Damned.* Mark. 16, As thoſe alſo

are,

are, *Which deny Christ before men.* Matth. 10. 33. Which Crime all commit, who deny themselves to be of the *True Religion*, as is manifest by the Example of St. *Peter*, who denying only, that he was a follower of Christ, and of his Company, was reputed to deny Christ; even as those will be, who culpably profess a *False Religion*. For such by their very Fact, deny the True, and themselves to be of the Communion thereof, and of the Company, and Society of the True Followers, Disciples and Servants of Christ, whereby, at his Judgement-seat, they will be reputed to have forsaken and denied him.

But to open this Point a little more (because many, even of the better sort, are brought thereby into no small danger of Perdition) this their conceit is not grounded upon any clear Text of *Gods Word*, or upon the Authority of any *Unerring Church*, but meerly upon a Mistake of their own; by which, out of one or two Truths, they infer a pernicious falshood; upon which, while they trust, they trust to a broken staff, which at their last Leap, will let them fall into the deep Ditch of Perdition, if before their Death they cast it not away.

Which presumptuous discarding of Divine Verities, revealed by Christ to his *Apostles*, for the direction of Mankind to Eternal Happiness, and by them laid up in the Treasury of the *Church*, as a *Sacred Depositum*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 20. under the sure Custody of the

Holy Ghoſt, is no leſs than High Treaſon againſt Chriſt our Saviour, in regard that it raiſes a moſt *pernicious Rebellion* in his Spiritual Kingdom, bringing part thereof again under the Tyranny of the Devil. It fruſtrates the full Operation of his Paſſion, extinguiſhes the true and right Worſhip of God, deſpoils *Chriſtian People* of *Divine Faith*, and thereby of the true means of Salvation. It deprives the Saints of due Honour, defrauds the Faithful departed of neceſſary Relief. It robs Heaven of Souls, and inriches Hell with innumerable unwary, and moſt unhappy People For which reſpects, it is rightly ſtiled one of the greateſt Sins, and of the loudeſt crying Crimes that is.

Note, That God cannot ſtir up, and draw men, by this his *Heavenly Grace*, to believe theſe Verities, unleſs they be propoſed to be believ'd without all mixture of falſhood; for if any falſhood be packt in among them, and propoſed with them for a *Divine Truth*, revealed by God, he cannot draw Men, by his Grace, to believe them thus mingled and prepoſed with *Falſhood*, as is manifeſt, becauſe he cannot induce men to believe any Falſhood at all. And therefore, whoſoever doth thruſt in, among ſome *Divine Vereties*, any falſe Doctrine, contrary to that which God hath revealed, propoſing the ſame to be believed as a Divine Truth, and therein ſtubbornly contradicting the *Teaching of the Church*, he debars God from co-operating with his Grace,

Grace, and from drawing people to believe, with *Divine Faith*, the Doctrine ſo mixt and propoſed.

It appears how juſt cauſe all *Proteſtants* have to return with ſpeed to the *Roman Church*, in which they may aſſuredly be ſaved, even by the Judgement of the moſt Learned among them, becauſe it is more than probable, that the *Proteſtant Profeſſion* is not a *ſaving Religion*, in regard, that the *Doctrine of Faith*, which it imbraceth, is not, nor cannot be wholly true, but really and certainly is mixed with much Falſhood,

1. Becauſe in divers weighty *Points of Faith*, it directly contradicts the expreſs Word of God, as I before have ſhewed.

2. Becauſe this *Doctrine of Faith*, is not directed by any ſure Rule of *Faith*, by any *Infallible Interpreter* of the Scriptures, by any Un-erring Judge of *Controverſies*, nor propoſed by any ſure and Infallible Propoſer.

3. Becauſe *Proteſtants* are divided into ſeveral *Branches* or *Sects*, which greatly differ, and are contrary one to another, in divers weighty Points of Faith, as I have before Noted.

And 4. Becauſe *Proteſtants* hold, that all Churches are ſubject to erring, yea, and have erred in their *Doctrine of Faith*. What aſſurance then have they, that theirs doth not err? none at all.

The *Religion* of the *True Messias*, is not to be introduc'd amongst the Nations of the Earth, or in one Year, or in one Age: But by degrees, and by the Labours and Charitable Endeavours of many Ages: Because the same is not to be brought in by Force, but by Fair Means: Not by the Souldiers Sword, but by the Teachers Word: Not by Violent Compulsion, but by Gentle Perswasion; such as the *Apostles* and *Apostolical Teachers* have ever us'd. *Going*, (saith our sweet Saviour) *Teach all Nations*, Matth. 28. And therefore this must needs be a work of long continuance; the Nations of the Earth being so many as they are, so dispers'd over the whole World, and dis-joyn'd one from another, by Mountains and Seas; so Barbarous, so Drench'd in Sin, inur'd to Carnal and Brutish Customs: And the Religion of the *Messias*, being so Holy and Profound, as *Gods Religion* must be. Yea, this Divine Work, of notifying the *Messias*, to all the Nations of the Earth, and of Converting them, or at least part of each of them to him, is to endure and last, even till the end of the World; as is manifest out of our Saviours Words, before alleadg'd out of the 24 of *Matth.* See the place, and weigh it well.

The Nations of the Earth, I say, for above these twelve hundred years, have not been Blessed in *Jesus*, by believing in him, for want of a *True Religion*, though very many of them, within

within the ſpace of time, have been Converted to him, by the *Roman Church*, by the Labours and Induſtry of *Papiſts*, both in *Europe*, *Aſia*, *Africa*, and the New-found World: Neither are they ever likely to be Bleſſed in Him: For if already he hath not taken order, to preſerve a True, Divine, and *Pure Religion* among them, to bring unto them the Promis'd Bleſſing, that is, to Sanctify, and Save them: He is never likely to do it. For he is not likely to be wiſer, or better, or more powerful hereafter, than he hath been heretofore: Neither is he likely to come into the World again, to found a new *Church* and *Religion*, and to eſtabliſh it better, than He did his firſt, for the Salvation of Mankind.

I demand of *Proteſtants*, if the Church of Chriſt, hath err'd, as they ſay, in her Doctrine of Faith, from whence proceeded this her erring? Did this happen, becauſe Chriſt could not keep her from erring; or becauſe he would not? If he could not, how is he God? How is he Omnipotent? How is it True, that he had *All Power given him in Heaven and Earth*, Mat. 28. 18. If Chriſt could enable his Apoſtles, to Preach his Religion, over the World, without danger of erring, and of deluding the Nations of the Earth; why could not he alſo enable their Succeſſors, the Ordinary Doctors and Paſtors of his Church, to Teach and continue the ſame Religion, in all ſucceeding Ages, without

danger of erring, and of misleading his People? If God could direct men to write his *Holy Scriptures*, without danger of erring; why can he not direct men, to explicate the same *Holy Scriptures* in all Ages, without danger of erring in matters of Faith?

Well then, *Protestants* must, say, that Christ could have preserv'd his Church, in all Ages, from danger of erring in her Doctrine of Faith; but would not. But why would he not? Did the Increase of his own Credit and Glory, move him to this neglect, or the good of Mankind? not the Increase of his own Credit. For what Credit, Honour, Glory, could accrew and rise to him, by the erring of his Church? Doth this commend his Workmanship, in Founding her? His Wisdom, Goodness, Power in Governing her? I think not. Nay, could it become the Wisdom of a Discreet man, to take so great Pains, and to suffer so Painful and Ignominious a Death, as Christ did, for the Founding of an Erring Church, which should delude and mislead the World? Would any *Honest Protestant*, if he had the like Power, that Christ had, have Founded so miserable a Church, as they esteem Christ to have Founded? I believe not.

Was it then, the good of Mankind, that invited Christ, to Constitute an erring Church? Truly no. For no good can come to men, by such a Church; but rather much harm;

harm; yea, infinite miſchief. As endleſs Diſcord, Broils, Contentions; Bloody Encounters, uncertainty in matters of Faith happen, as amongſt the Reformers, contempt of all Religion; and the ruine and deſtruction of Infinite Souls. For the Devil would never go about to ſeduce the Church, and to Pollute her Doctrine, with Errours and Superſtitions, but to do Miſchief, and to bring Souls to Perdition.

Wherefore, ſeeing that it could not redound, either to the Glory of God, or the good of Men, that Chriſt ſhould Found an Erring Church; it is very groſs Errour, to hold that he did. And thoſe, who ſo think; do greatly miſtake, and exceedingly wrong the Wiſdom, and Goodneſs of our Saviour; as will more clearly appear in the enſuing Diſcourſe.

If it be true, that the Church of Chriſt, for ſo many Ages, hath Err'd in her Doctrine of Faith: Imbracing, as it were, with both her Arms, and inſtilling into her Followers, many Pernicious Errors, many groſs Superſtitions: Notwithſtanding, that Chriſt her Spouſe and Saviour Promis'd, *Matth.* 16. *That the Gates of Hell ſhould never prevail againſt her.* That the Holy Ghoſt ſhould *Abide with her Paſtors for ever*, *St.* John *cap.* 14. and ſhould *Teach them all Truth*, Joh. 16. That he himſelf would be with them *All days, even till the end of the World*, Mat. 28. And notwithſtanding, that God Promis'd, that *His*

Spirit and Word ſhould never depart from this Church, Iſaias 59. That ſhe ſhould *Stand for ever*, Daniel 2. And ſhould *Never be Corrupted*, Daniel 7. Being indeed the *Pillar and ground of Truth*, as the Apoſtle affirms, 1 *Tim.* 3. If I ſay, the Doctrine of *Proteſtant Teachers*, about the Erring of the Church of Chriſt, being ſo contrary to the Word of God as it is, be true.

I demand of Prudent and Underſtanding *Proteſtants*, how it can be defended, that God is truly Good, hath a fatherly care of Men, doth truly love them, and tender their Spiritual good, and hath a true deſire of their Eternal Salvation: Seeing, that whereas he doth freely permit the Devil, to fill the World with falſe and wicked Religions, with Abominable and Deteſtable Worſhips, to bring Men aſſuredly to everlaſting Damnation: He himſelf (though he could moſt eaſily do it) doth not continue, maintain, and uphold in the World, in all Ages, ſo much as one True Religion, ſo much as one Holy and Divine Worſhip, to bring them to Salvation? No, not after that his Bleſſed Son made Man, by Infinite Humility, by Innumerable Labours undergone for his ſake, by ſhedding his moſt precious Blood, had endeavour'd to appeaſe his Indignation, to mitigate his Wrath, and to gain and purchaſe Love and Mercy for them.

What

What Christian Breast, can believe so monstrous a thing as this? Or who can Harbour so base a Thought of the Wisdom, Goodness, Sweetness and Mercy of God? Or how come Discreet and Understanding *Protestants*, to swallow so gross an Absurdity as this? If the Tenet of the *Protestant Teachers*, touching the Erring of the Church, be true; how is that true which Christ says, *John* 3. 16. *That God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that every one that believeth in him, perish not, but may have Life everlasting. For God sent not his Son to judge* (that is to damn) *the World; but that the World may be Sav'd by him*: Or that which St. *Paul* says, 1 *Tim.* 2. 4. *God will have all men Sav'd, and come to the knowledge of the Truth*? How I say are these Divine Assertions true, if to bring Men to Salvation, God doth not ever preserve a True Religion in the World? Doth not ever uphold the Truth of his Gospel?

For by false Religions, no man can be Saved; in regard, that the Devil, and not God, is the Author and Suggestor of False Religions, by which he intends the Damnation of Men, and not their Salvation, as is manifest. Yea, he neither can, nor will induce men, to invent a Religion able and fit, to save men in. Mark this well, and also Note, that our Saviour, in the Sentence alleadg'd by the word *World*, doth not mean that only Age, in which He and his Apostles liv'd,

liv'd, nor thoſe men only, which then liv'd: But all following Ages, and all that were to live even till the day of Doom. All which, God would have to come to the knowledge of the Truth; namely, of his Divine Goſpel: And to ſave them all, he ſent his bleſſed Son into the World. And therefore we muſt of neceſſity grant, that he provideth the People of all Ages, of a True and Viſible Church, by which they may be Sav'd: And that he ever preſerves in all Ages, the Truth of his Goſpel (of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks in the Sentence alleadg'd) that ſo men may come to the knowledge thereof.

For if the true Goſpel of Chriſt, be not extant in all Ages, how hath God a true Will and Deſire, that the People of all Ages, ſhould come to the knowledge thereof? Neither is it ſufficient, that it be extant in the *BIBLE*, for all to come to the knowledge thereof: For all cannot read the *Bible*; neither can thoſe which are skill'd in Reading, thence pick out the true Goſpel, without the help of a True *Interpreter*: But it muſt be ever extant in the Sums of Chriſtian Doctrine left in the Church with the Ordinary *Doctors* and *Paſtors* of the Church, whom others are bound to *Hear and Obey*, Luke 10. Heb. 13. And of whom they are to learn Divine Faith, which is gotten *by Hearing*, Rom. 10. which is clear out of *Matth.* 24. where Chriſt expreſly foretells, that his True Goſpel, (*viz.*) the ſame that he

he Taught, ſhould be *Preached* to all Nations, even till the end of the World: And therefore the True Goſpel muſt not be reſerved only in the *Bible*, but be ever extant in the Preaching of the Church.

Out of that which hath been ſpoken in this Dicourſe, who doth not ſee, that the Prime and Fundamental Article, of the *Proteſtant Religion*, doth not only extreamly Diſgrace the Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Mercy of God, and extenuate the Merits of Chriſt; but doth alſo tend to the Denial of all Chriſtianity: to the utter neglect of God: Yea, and to plain *Atheiſm* it ſelf? For who will think, that the Son of God, really Dy'd for Mankind, if he gain'd ſo little for them? Or that there is a God, that doth truly love Men, and tender their good, if he be ſo unmindful of them, and of their Eternal Happineſs and Salvation. The tending then of the *Proteſtant Religion*, ſo much to the Diſgrace of Chriſt, and of God, doth clearly ſhew, who was the firſt Founder of it.

Wherefore, as certain as it is, that there is a God, who is Infinitely Wiſe, Good and Merciful; and who doth truly love Mankind, and tender their Eternal Good: And as certain as it is, that Chriſt the Son of God, Died for us, took a moſt provident courſe, for our Salvation; and that his Merits are of ineſtimable worth: So certain is it that God hath ever preſerv'd in the World,

World, a True, and visible Church, in which Men may be Sav'd if they will. For Christ did not *Light up a Candle to put it under a Bushel*, Mat. 5. And so certain it is, that the *Protestant Religion*, which is Erected upon so bad a Foundation as the Erring of the Church is, is neither good, nor sufficient to Salvation.

Testimonies

Teſtimonies *of the* SCRIPTURE, *evidently convincing, that there can be no hope of Salvation for ſuch as are ſeparated from the Church, (which is the Holy* Catholick *and* Apoſtolick Church*) by* Hereſie *or* Schiſm.

St. Paul Rom. 16. 17, 18. I *Beſeech you, Brethren, obſerve thoſe who make Schiſms and Scandals, contrary to the Doctrine which you have been taught, and avoid them. For ſuch men ſerve not our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, but their own Belly, and by kind* Speeches, *and* Benedictions, *ſeduce the hearts of the ſimple.*

Now to manifeſt how much ſuch *Heretick*s are to be Deteſted, he writes thus to *Titus*, (Tit. 3. 10, 11.) *A man that is an* Heretick, *after the firſt and ſecond admonition, avoid knowing, that he is ſuch an one, is ſubverted, and Sinneth, being condemned by his own judgement.*

To Prevent the making a Schiſm in this Body (the Church) he ſays, [1 Cor. 1. 10.] *I beſeech you Brethren, by the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that you all ſay one thing, and that there be no* Schiſms *among you, but*

that

that you be perfect in one ſenſe, and in one knowledge.

Again, [Eph. 4. 1.] *I beſeech you, that you walk worthy of the Vocation in which you are called; and a little after, carefully to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; One Body and one Spirit, as you are called, in one hope of your Vocation, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God and Father of all.*

Your Faith (i. e. *the* Roman) *is ſpoken of throughout the whole World,* (i. e. *is* Catholick,) Romans 1. 8.

Although we, or an Angel of Heaven Preach to you any other Goſpel *then that which we have Preached to you, be he* Anathema, (Gal. 1. 8.)

Therefore if we, or an Angel *Preach any other* Goſpel *then that, the* Roman Faith *is the* Catholick, *let him be* Anathema.

Again, *Brethren, ſtand ye faſt, and hold ye the Traditions which ye have received, whether by word, or by our Epiſtle.* (2 Theſſal. 11. 15.) *Here are both Written and Unwritten* Traditions *given equally in Charge, and the Unwritten named firſt.*

Remember the Prelates *who have ſpoken to you the* Word of God; *whoſe Faith follow. Obey your* Prelates, *and be ſubject to them, for they watch, as being to render account for your Souls.* (Heb. 13. 7, 17.)

Contend earneſtly for the Faith *once* Delivered *to the* Saints. (*S. Jude* 3.)

How

How was this *Faith* once *Delivered* to the *Saints*?

Faith *comes by* Hearing. (*Rom.* 10. 17.)

Whom did the *Saints* hear?

Hear *the* Church. *If he neglect to hear the* Church, *let him be to thee as an* Heathen *and a* Publican. (S. *Matth.* 18. 17.)

Which is the *Church*, that if I neglect to *hear*, I am as an *Heathen* and a *Publican?*

That which is built upon S. *Peter*. *Thou art* Peter, *and upon* this Rock *will I build* my Church, *and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* (S. *Matth.* 16. 18.)

No Author of our ſide denied S. *Peters* being at *Rome*, till we diſcerned the *Conſequence*, *That upon his* Perſonal *Being there*, *they grounded a* Primicy *in that* See. See Dr. *Donne Serm. in Pſalm* 11. 3. pag. 25. *Note that*

Elſewhere thus. *Pope* Hyginus, *who was within* 150 *years after* CHRIST, *and the Eighth* Biſhop *of* that See, *after S.* Peter. *Dr.* Donne *Serm. in S.* John 10. 22.

The Church. 3 Reg. 8. 14. Matth. 18. 17.
The Church Unity *figured by* Noah's Ark. Gen. 6. 14. 1 Pet. 3. 20.
By the new Jeruſalem. Apocalips 21. 2. *See alſo* Cantic. 4. 12. 6, 8. Pſal. 79. 9. Cantic. 2. 15. Iſaiah 5. 2. Jerem. 2. 21. 12. 10. Matth. 20. 1. Mark 12. 1. Luke 5. 3. Mat. 13. 47. 13. 24. 25.

The

The Church *the* Pillar *of* Truth, *and* Infallible. Isa. 29. 21. Matth. 16. 18. Mac. 28. 20. Luke 22. 32. John 14. 16. 16, 13. 17. 11, 20. 1 Tim. 3. 15. 1. Jo. 2. 27.

The Church *the* Body of CHRIST. Cantic. 4. 7. 9, 11, 12. Ephes. 1. 22. 4. 4. 5. 23. 1 Corinth. 12, 27. Jo. 14. 23. 2. Corinth. 6. 16.

The Church *of the* Faithful *planted, and propagated by sound Doctrine.* Jo. 1. 12. 3. 3. Rom. 8. 13. 9. 8. Gallat. 3. 20. 4. 19. Ephes. 1. 50. Tit. 1. 1. 1 Cor. 4. 15. Philem. 10. 1 Peter 1. 27. 1 Jo. 3. 9. 5. 1, 18. Jam. 1. 18.

The Church *the* Spouse of CHRIST. Psal. 44. 11. Ezech. 16. 9. 2 Cor. 11. 2. Ephes. 5. 5. 26. Apocal. 19. 8. 21. 10.

CHRIST *the Head of the Church.* Osea 2. 2. 1 Cor. 12. 27. Eph. 1. 22. 4. 15. 5. 23. Colos. 1. 18. 2. 10.

The Keys *of the* Church, *and their* Power, *Promised, Delivered, Exercised.* Matth. 16. 18. Jo. 20. 23. Matth. 18. 17.

Excommunication *instituted by* CHRIST. Matth. 5. 29. 16. 19. 18. 8, 18. Mark 9. 42. Jo. 20. 23.

In use with the Apostles. 1 Cor. 5. 3. 10. 2 Thess. 3. 6. 14. 1 Tim. 1. 20. Tit. 3. 10. Matth. 18. 17.

Confession of Sins. Gen. 41. 9. Levit. 16. 21. 39. 26. 40 Number. 5. 6. Jos. 7. 19. 2 Reg. 24. 17. 1 Esdras 9. 6. 2 Esdr. 9. 2. Psal. 27. 7. 31. 5. 37. 18. 94. 2. Proverb. 16. 3. 18. 17. 28. 13. Eccl. 4. 25. 31. 7. 34. 17.

27. Isa. 38. 15. Daniel 9. 5. Matth. 3. 6. 16. 19. Luke 11. 4. 18. 13. Jo. 20. 23. Jac. 5. 16. 1 Jo. 1. 8, 9.

Of Hereticks *and false* Teachers. *See*

Jud. cap. 1. 1 Cor. 11. 19. 1 Tim. c. 1. v. 20. 2 Tim. c. 2. v. 18. 1 Jo. 2. 18. 2 Jo. 7. Apocol. 2. 15. Mat. 24. 5. 24. Jo. 5. 43. 1 Tim. 4. 1. 2 Tim. 3. 1. 5. 2 Pet. 2. 1. 3. 3. Deu. 13. 1. Mat. 7. 15. Rom. 16. 17. Tit. 3. 10. 2 Thesal. 3. 14. Joan. 2. 10. Deut. 13. 5. 18. 20. 3. King. 18. 40. 4 K. 10. 25

Heresie *is a* Spiritual Fornication, *and* Idolatry. Deut. 31. 16. Jude 2. 17. 27. 33. Isa. 1. 21. 57. 3. Jer. 3. 1. Ezeck. 6. 9. 19. Osea 1. 2. 2. 4. 4. 15. Apoc. 18. 3.

Teſtimonies *of the* Fathers, *ſhewing their* Affection *and* Zeal *to* Catholick Unity, *and their Deteſtation of* Schiſm *and* Diviſions.

In Pſal. 54. *ſaith St.* Auſtin.

1. OF *the* Donatiſts, 'We have each 'of us one *Baptiſm*, in this 'they were with me; we *Cele-* 'brated the *Feaſts* of the *Martyrs*, in This 'they were with me; we *frequented* the *So-* 'lemnity of *Eaſter*, in this they were with 'me: But they were not in all things with 'me; in *Schiſm*, they were not with me; in 'Hereſie, they were not with me; in many 'things they were with me, and in ſome few 'things they were not with me; but in thoſe 'few things in which they were not with me, 'thoſe many things do not profit them, in 'which they were with me.

2. *Speaking to the* Donatiſts, [*Epiſt.* 48.] *ſaith*, 'You are with us in *Baptiſm*, in the 'Creed, and in other *Sacraments* of the Lord: 'But in the *Spirit of Unity*, in the *Bond of* 'Peace,

'*Peace*, and finally, in the *Catholick Church*, 'you are not with us.

3. *To the ſame purpoſe Writteth St.* Cyprian, *in his Book* [De unitate Eccleſia,] 'One *Church* '(*ſaith he*) the *Holy Ghoſt*, in the perſon of 'our Lord, deſigneth, and ſaith, one is my '*Dove*; This Unity of the *Church*, he that 'holdeth not, doth he think that he holdeth 'the *Faith*? he that withſtandeth and reſiſt-'eth the *Church*, he that forſaketh *Peters* '*Chair*, upon which the Church was built, 'doth he truſt that he is in the *Church*? 'Where the bleſſed Apoſtle St. *Paul* alſo 'ſheweth this *Sacrament* of *Unity*, [ſaying one '*Body*, and one *Spirit*, [*Epheſ.* 4. 4.] which '*Unity*, we *Biſhops* eſpecially, that Rule in the '*Church*, ought to hold faſt, and maintain, 'that we may prove the *Epiſcopal Function* alſo 'it ſelf, to be One, and undevided.

4. *And again, in one of his Epiſtles*, [Epiſtle 40.] 'There is One *God*, and One *Chriſt*, 'and One *Church*, and One *Chair*, by our '*Lords Voice*, Founded upon *Peter*: Another '*Altar* to be ſet up, or a New *Prieſthood* to 'be made; beſides one *Altar*, and one *Prieſt-'hood*, is impoſſible, Whoſoever gathereth 'elſewhere, Scattereth: It is *Adulterous*, it 'is *Impious*, it is *Sacrilegious*, whatſoever is 'inſtituted by *Mans fury*, to the breach of 'Gods *Divine Diſpenſation*: Get ye far from 'the *Contagion* of ſuch Men, and fly from 'their *Speeches* as from a *Canker*, and *Peſti-'lence*; our Lord having premoniſhed,

'and warned us beforehand, ſaying, *they are* 'Blind leaders of the Blind. Matth. 15. 14.

5. *St.* Auguſtin *ſays of the* Donatiſts, [*De Bapt. l.* 1. *cap.* 8.] 'Thoſe whom the *Donatiſts* 'heal of the wound of *Idolatry*, and *Infidi-* 'lity, they themſelves wound more dange- 'rouſly with the wound of *Schiſm.*

6. *And again*, [Super. Geſt. Emerit.] 'Out 'of the *Catholick Church*, an *Heretick* may 'have all things, but *Salvation*; he may have 'the *Sacraments*, he may ſing *Hallelujah*, he 'may Anſwer *Amen*, he may keep the *Goſpel*, 'he may have the *Faith*, and preach it, only 'Salvation he cannot have.

7. *In like manner*, *St.* Dionyſius *Biſhop of* Alexandria, [*as* Euſebius *witneſſeth*, hiſt. l. 6. c. 45.] *Writing to* Novatian, *ſaith*, 'A Man 'ought rather to endure all things, than to 'conſent to the *Diviſion* of the *Church* of *God*; 'ſince that *Martyrdom*, to which men expoſe 'themſelves, to hinder the *Diſmembring* of the 'Church, is no leſs Glorious then what a man 'ſuffers for refuſing to *Sacrifice* to *Idols*; nay, 'in my Opinion, this ſeems of the two, the 'more Glorious *Martyrdom*; for in the other 'cauſe, he that ſuffers is a *Martyr* upon 'his own account, but in this he is a *Martyr* 'for no leſs than the *Body of* CHRIST, the 'Church.

8. *Alſo St.* Cyprian [lib. Deunitat. Eccleſ.] 'Do they think (*ſaith he*) that *Chriſt* is a- 'mong them when they are Aſſembled? I 'ſpeak of thoſe which make Aſſemblies out

'of

'of the *Church of Christ*, no, although they 'were drawn to Torments, and Execution, 'for the Confeſſion of the Name of *Chriſt*; 'yet this pollution is not waſhed away; no, 'not with their Blood. This inexpiable, and 'inexcuſable crime of *Schiſm* is not purged 'away, even by Death it ſelf. That a man 'cannot be a *Martyr*, that is, not in the 'Church.

9. *And Again*, (he ſaith) 'He cannot 'have God for his *Father*, that has not the 'Church for his *Mother*.

10. *So likewiſe St.* Pacianus, *in one of his Epiſtles*, [Epiſtle 2. ad Sempr.] 'Although that 'Novatian (*ſaith he*) hath been put to Death, '(*for Chriſt*) yet he has not received a Crown, 'and why? becauſe he was ſeparated from the 'peace of the *Church*, from *Concord*, from 'that Mother, of whom, whoſoever will 'be a *Martyr*, muſt be a Portion.

To the ſame purpoſe alſo, theſe words of Lactantius *are very remarkable.* 'It is the *Catho-* 'lick Church only, that keeps the true Worſhip 'of God. This is the Fountain of *Truth*, 'this is the *Houſe of Faith*, this is the *Temple* 'of God; into which, if a man enter not, 'or from which, if any man goes out, he is 'an *Alian*, and *Stranger*, from the hope of 'Everlaſting Life and *Salvation*. No man 'muſt by obſtinate Contention flatter him- 'ſelf, for it ſtands upon *Life* and *Salvation*. '[St. Cyprian 55. ad Cornel. Num. 3.] *ſays*, 'The *Church* never departs from that which

'ſhe once hath known; and St. *Irenaus*, [lib. 1. cap. 3.] 'That the *Apoſtles* have laid up 'in the *Church*, as a rich *Treaſury*, all *Truth*. 'It were an infinite labour to recite all that 'the *Fathers* ſay of this matter; all counting 'it a moſt Pernicious *Abſurdity*, to affirm, 'That the *Church of Chriſt* may err in *Do-'ctrine of Faith*. For example, How could 'God glory in the multitude of ſuch as follow 'his Church, if by ſo doing, they ſhould be 'led into Errour. And yet, *Iſaias* 2. *'God 'ſeems to Glory in the multitude of thoſe who 'confidently reſort to the* Church, *as to a Miſ-'treſs of aſſured Truth, to be inſtructed by her 'ſaying.* v. 3. *Let us go up to the Mountain of 'our Lord, and he will teach us his ways, and we 'ſhall walk in his Paths, and he ſhall judge among 'the Nations.* Behold, Chriſt Erecting a Court 'or Tribunal in his Church *to judge among 'Nations*, and deſide all their Controverſies 'which muſt needs ſuppoſe Obedience to be 'yielded to this Judgement. Yea, the ſame 'Prophet adds, Ch. 54. v. 17. That *no Weapon 'that is formed againſt thee ſhall* proſper; *and 'every Tongue reſiſting thee in judgement, thou 'ſhalt condemn.* And the Prophet there, from 'the beginning, manifeſtly ſpeaks of *Chriſt's 'Church. Thirdly* Iſaiah, Ch. 60. 12. *The 'Nation and Kingdom that will not ſerve thee, 'ſhall periſh.* Under pain of *periſhing*, the 'Church muſt be obeyed: Whence Fourthly, 'Ezek. ch. 44. v. 23. *They* (that is the Prieſt) 'ſhall teach the people, what is between a Holy thing,

'*thing, and a thing Polluted, and the difference* '*between clean, and unclean. They ſhall ſhew* '*them, and when there ſhall be Controverſie, they* '*ſhall ſtand in Judgments.* This being their 'Office, the peoples Office muſt needs be, 'not to Judge them, but Obey them.

Fifthly, 'Chriſt (*Matth.* 18. 17.) com-'mands to Obey the Church, under pain 'of being held here on Earth, as *Pub-*'*licans* and *Heathens*, and of having this 'ſentence ratified in Heaven. '*Tell the* 'Church, (ſaith he) *And if he will not* '*hear the* Church, *let him be unto thee a* '*Heathen, and a Publican; and I ſay unto you,* '*whomſoever you ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be* '*bound in Heaven, and whatſoever you ſhall* '*looſe upon Earth, ſhall be looſed alſo in Heaven.* 'Here you ſee Obedience to be yielded, under 'pain of being held *as a Publican*, or *an Hea-*'*then*; and this Sentence to be ratified in Hea-'ven. Now if the Church could Err in 'teaching, (*for Example*) that Chriſt is truly 'preſent in the *Sacrament*, and hence obliged 'all to *Adore* him therein, as much as they '*Adore* him in Heaven, and could oblidge 'them to this, under pain of being held as '*Publicans* and *Heathens*, and held ſo as well 'in Heaven, as upon Earth; ſurely this can-'not be an Errour; for then in Heaven this 'Sentence would never be ratified.

St. Aug. Cont. Epiſt. Fundam. c. 5. *I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the* Church *moved me.*

What ways the Church has made use of, to settle mens minds in the Doctrin *of the* Sacrament *of the* Eucharist, *or the* Lord's Last Supper.

TO make this appear more fully, I will give you a brief Relation of the past Proceedings of the Church, in the Decision of the Disputes concerning the *Real Presence* of Christ in the *Sacrament*, and in the *Substantial Conversion* of the *Elements* of *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*.

This *Real Presence*, and *Substantial Conversion Berengarius*, and some Followers of his long ago denied: Who being complained of, two *Councils* were called one after another, at *Rome* and *Verseilis*, *Anno Domini* 1050 *Berengarius* Summoned, and he not appearing, his Heterodox Opinions were condemned. He (according to the new *Protestant* Grounds) thinking his a Doctrine of great consequence, and the Decrees of the two *Councils*, a manifest Error; and that himself had manifest Scripture, and Demonstration against it, judged

judged himſelf freed from the obedience of ſilence, or noncontradiction, of theſe Councils. And ſo he, and his Followers publickly juſtified his *Tenet*, deſiring a reverſion, by ſome new Council, of the former ſentence againſt it.

Upon this revived Diſturbance of the *Church*, another Council, five years after, is Aſſembled at *Tours*, *Anno* 1055. not far diſtant from *Angiers*, where he was Archdeacon. Here himſelf, with others of his Party, were preſent, his Cauſe pleaded, his Demonſtrations conſidered; and after all, his Opinion again condemned; himſelf alſo Recanting it.

The Council diſmiſſed, he finds yet other new Reaſons, and a greater ſtrength in his former; and falls again to the abetting, maintaining, and ſpreading abroad his old Doctrin. A Fourth Council upon theſe new Troubles of the Church, *Anno* 1059. Four years after the laſt, was called at *Rome*; where himſelf alſo was preſent. Some ſay, long Diſputation there had, his new Plea for it was found too light, and rejected: And his Opinion, oppoſing Subſtantial Converſion, again condemned, both by himſelf and Council, conſiſting of an Hundred and Three Biſhops.

The Third time this man revolts, and publiſhes a Writing, (anſwered by *Lanfrank*, afterwards Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*) wherein he complains, That ſome particular Enemies

mies of his ſwayed the former Council, and had made him to ſwear Contradictions.

Theſe new Imputations occaſioned a Fifth Council to be called at *Rome*, *Anno Domini* 1078. in which were new Diſputings, his laſt Cavils cenſured, and the Article of a ſubſtantial Converſion further vindicated; and his Error of the Subſtance of Bread remaining, again condemned by this Council: And laſtly condemned by himſelf.

Such was the Sentence of Five General Councils of the Weſt; and the ſame Arguments then refuted, yet are ſtill urged; as will appear by the Writers of thoſe times, (*Lanfrank Guitmundus*, *Algerus*,) to any one that pleaſeth to peruſe them: The ſame Authorites out of the Fathers then preſſed, as are ſtill produced a-new by the Reformed, and with the ſame Anſwers repelled. All theſe Councils (if ſome of them in the Members thereof, leſs numerous, yet) univerſally accepted by all the Weſtern Churches; where this Controverſie was only agitated: Not one ſingle Biſhop thereof (that is known) diſſenting, or ſiding with the *Berengarians*. Look we for more ſatisfaction yet?

When the Fervor of parties, in this matter, was much allay'd, and the Church had had ſufficient leiſure to conſider, and digeſt the former Conciliary Degrees, above an Hundred years after the laſt of the Councils afore-mentioned, the great *Laterian* Council was

was assembled, under *Innocent* the Third; in which were present the Patriarch of *Constantinople* and *Jerusalem* in person, and the Substitutes of the Patriarch of *Antioch*; and of the *Alexandrian* Patriarch (lying under the *Saracen* yoak) *Germanus*, his Deacon.

[*'Tis true indeed, that some of these Patriarchs were then* Latines *or belonging to the* Latine, *or* Western *Church*; *because both* Constantinople *and* Jerusalem, *being held in Possession* (*the one for near* 60, *the other for near* 100 *years*) *by the* Latines; Latine *Patriarchs were then Elected: As sometimes* Greeks *also, by the Power of the Emperors, have been Bishops of* Rome. *But yet they were ths Lawful, and the only Patriarchs of those Sees, at that time.*]

And present there were besides These, a considerable number of other *Eastern* Bishops; the whole Council consisting of *four hundred and twelve* Bishops, and *Seventy Archbishops*. Now this Council again, instead of reversing, declared for a Substantial Conversion: Where also first (that is, in a Council) was used the Name of *Transubstantiation*.

Two Hundred years after this, again, the Council at *Florence* declared likewise for the same, in the Articles of Instruction for the *Jacobins*, and *Armenians*, in these Words, *By force of the Words of Christ*; *the Substance of Bread is converted* (or changed) *into the* Body of Christ; *and the* Substance *of* Wine *into his* Blood.

Now

Now if the Decrees of ſo many *Councils*, ſo often weighing the Adverſaries Reaſons, and Evidences, was not ſufficient for ſettling ſuch a Point, what can hereafter be ſufficient! Or how can we ever hope, that any Controverſie ſhall be finally determined, or ended, by any future *Council*! Can there be any ground here, to queſtion the integrity, or lawful proceedings of ſo many Councils, at ſuch a diſtance from one another? All concurring in the ſame judgment, for a *Real Preſence*, and a Subſtantial Converſion. Or can there be any *New Light* in this Point, (ſince there are no *New Revelations*) attainable in theſe preſent times, which thoſe were never capable of? Or, if there could, is not much the *major* part of the preſent *Clergy*, and *Eccleſiaſtical Governours* of *Chriſtianity*, ſtill ſwayed on the ſame ſide, againſt any preſent Evidence pretended? How then can the Reformed, reviving the former Arguments of *Bertram*, *Scotus*, *Erigena*, *Berengarius*, *&c.* ſtill trouble the *Church* again, with urging the ſame Arguments, after the judgement of ſo many *Councils* already paſſed upon them?

Can any deſire a fairer Judicature by *Councils*, in any matter than there has been already in this? And is there any reaſon, that *Proteſtants* ſhould refer themſelves in this Point (as they do) to the judgment of a new *Council*? If all the *Councils* ſucceſſively erred in this Point, ſo manifeſtly, as that they

they could not lawfully oblige their Subjects to obedience, the next, and the next to that, of ſuch *Councils* as ever we can hope for, may Err ſo too, and the ſame Obedience be denied to them; whilſt one pretended Evidence, or Demonſtration, quelled, another new one ſtarts up, and demands ſatisfaction.

But if theſe Councils be invalid, or not ſufficient for the eſtabliſhing the belief of a Subſtantial Converſion, let us ſee the Proceedings of the Reformation here, to repeal their *Acts*, and to eſtabliſh the contrary to them.

After all theſe Councils fore-named, and that of *Trent* added to them, *Anno Domini* 1562. a Synod is called at *London*, of Two Provinces only of the Weſt, conſiſting of about Twenty four Biſhops, and Two Metropolitans: And by Theſe, againſt all the former Councils above-ſaid, it is Decreed, (*Articulo* 28.) 'That the change of the Bread 'and Wine in the Euchariſt, is repugnant 'to the plain words of Scripture, and over-'throws the nature of a Sacrament. *Thus that Article.*

Now, in obedience to this their Decree, they tie their Subjects to ſubſcribe, that *they acknowledge it* (that is, believe it) 'to be agree-'able to the Word of God. [See their Synod 1603. *Can.* 63.] This is an Obedience, which themſelves (though Subjects) to deny to the Decrees of all thoſe precedent Councils; where-

wherein the judgments of all the Biſhops and Metropolitans of the *Weſtern* World then concurred; and amongſt the reſt, Thoſe of theſe Two Provinces alſo: And yet doth their Synod require it.

Here let a Sober Chriſtian judge, if Aſſent be held due to this *London-Synod*, is it not to thoſe others much rather? To thoſe others, I ſay, incomparably more numerous, accepted by the *Weſt* for many Ages, and adher'd to ſtill by the greateſt part thereof: Having before them the Scriptures, and the Traditive Expoſition of them; weighing the Arguments, that are ſtill on foot; meeting ſo often, and ſo concluding ſtill in the ſame judgment.

But if thoſe other Councils are juſtified, by the Practice of this *Engliſh Synod*, in their requiring Aſſent, and Obedience, then is the Reformation rendred unlawful; as likewiſe their *Appeal* to future *Councils*; which can afford us no more juſt ſatisfaction, than the fore-paſs'd.

Here you have ſeen, that for the Deſiding this Controverſie, a General Council (that is, the moſt General that the Times would permit) was aſſembled in the *Weſt*; nay, of Theſe more than One, as has been ſhewed: A 'Subſtantial Converſion of the '*Elements*, and *Real Preſence*, declared to be 'the ſenſe of thoſe Scriptures, and a reverence ſuitable required in this great Myſtery: Not one Biſhop in theſe *Councils* (for any thing

thing we know,) Diſſenting; and Thoſe of the *Eaſtern Churches* abſent, conſenting in the ſame judgement. What more can be done? Ought not *Senſe*, *Reaſon*, and *Philoſophy*, here, be ſilenced? and ought not ſuch a Decree rather be aſſented to, than the contrary Decree of the forementioned Synod called at *London*?

'Now for a further *Confirmation* of This 'Doctrine, I will here deliver Evident Te-'ſtimonies of moſt Eminent Fathers, and 'Doctors of the *Church*, concerning it.

The Truth of the Euchariſt, *and* Real Preſence *of the* Body *and* Blood of Chriſt *in the* Euchariſt, *Confirmed by the* Teſtimonies of the Fathers.

MAny of the *Holy Fathers* have taught, That the *Faithful* partake of the *Body and Blood of Chriſt* in the *Euchariſt*, not with a mental mouth by *Faith* only, as *Calvin* would have it, but even with a Bodily Mouth in the way of a true and proper Eating: So St. *Auguſtin l. 2. contra Adverſarium legis & Prophetarum c. 9.* 'We receive with a faithful 'heart and mouth *Chriſt Jeſus*, giving us his 'Fleſh to eat, and his Blood to drink; and St. *Leo, Serm. 6. de jejunio menſis ſeptimi*, where he Writes thus, 'We ought To to communi-'cate at the holy *Table*, as that there be no 'doubt of the truth of *Chriſt*'s *Body*, for the 'ſame is taken with the Mouth, which is be-'lieved with the Heart.

In like manner, *Calvin*'s Errour is Excluded by St. *John Damaſcen*, for he tells us, *De Orthodoxa Fide l. c. 14.* 'The Bread and Wine

'Wine are no figures of the Body and Blood 'of Chriſt, far be this from us to imagine, 'but the very Body of Chriſt; our bleſſed 'Lord himſelf teſtifying this is not a ſign of 'my Body, but my Body; nor a ſign of my 'Blood, but my Blood: The like hath *Theophylact.* in S. *Matth.* 26. and St. *Mark* 14. where explaining the ſelf-ſame Words of Chriſt, he adds, 'He ſhews that the *Hoſt* 'which is offered upon the Altar is the very 'Body of our Lord, and no *Figure*; for he 'ſaid not, this is a Figure of my Body, but '*my Body*; hence is it, that the *Holy Fathers* 'Teach, that by receiving the *Euchariſt*, 'Chriſt is truly incorporated with us, and 'not by *Faith* only, or *Figuratively*, but 'united to us indeed; ſo ſpeak the *Holy Fa-*'*thers*: For thus ſays St. *John Chryſoſtom*, *Homil.* 3. on St. *Matth.* 'He incorporates 'himſelf (*ſays he*) with us, and not by *Faith* 'only, but he makes us his Body verily and 'indeed.

So St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *in St. John l.* 10. *c.* 13. tells us, 'We are not only united 'to Chriſt ſpiritually, by a true *Faith* and 'ſincere *Charity*, but Chriſt alſo dwells in us 'Corporally, by Communication of the Fleſh 'of Chriſt, and that Corporal Union of 'Chriſt with the Faithful; therein by participation of the *Euchariſt*, he Illuſtrates by this Inſtance: 'Like as (*ſays he*) if one 'blends one piece of melted Wax with ano-'ther, ſo as one lump ſeems to be made

'up of both the pieces; even ſo by Commu-
'nication of the Body and Blood of Chriſt,
'he is in us, and we in him, for the corrup-
'table Nature of a Body, cannot otherwiſe
'paſs over to Life and Incorruption, unleſs
'a body of Natural Life be joyned with
'it.

St. *Gregory Nyſſen* uſes another inſtance, *in Orat. Catech. cap.* 37. where he ſpeaks thus: 'In like manner as a little, *Leaven*,
'as the Apoſtle Teſtifies, 2 *Cor.* 11. *Leavens*
'*the whole Lump*; even ſo, that Life giving
'Body paſſing into our Bodies, Tranſlates it
'ſelf wholly into us, and changes us, as it
'renders ours like it, and immortal, in due
'time; for it is neceſſary, that our Nature, ſo
'far as may be, ſhould admit ſo Efficatious a
'power into our Bodies, where he alſo teaches
'us, that it behoves us to believe, that like
'as the forbidden Fruit was corporally eaten
'by *Adam*, even ſo that the Body of Chriſt is
'taken of us corporally, and received in
'the Belly, ſo that it is not only mentally by
'*Faith*, or *Figuratively*, as *Calvin* would have
'it, ſo as the wholſom Medicine be in us,
'be no otherwiſe in us than the Deſtructive
'poyſon, which was bodily received, to Re-
'peal the ſame by a contrary Action. Read that whole Chapter then, which nothing can be more clearly againſt the Errours of the *Calviniſts*, maintaining the Body and Blood of Chriſt to be taken by us Spiritually and not Corporally. Laſt of all, the *Holy Fathers*

Teach

Teach, that the *Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt*, for the ſake of Chriſt's being there, is to be Adored; but Adored it ought not to be, nay, ſuch Adoration would be Idolatry, if Chriſt be not truly and really there contained; for that Worſhip or Adoration that is called *Latria*, is to be given to God alone; whence it is plain, that in the opinion of the *Holy Fathers*, Chriſt is truly and really contained in the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, now that the Holy *Fathers* every where teach, that the *Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt* is to be Adored, becauſe of Chriſts being there, appears plainly from St. *Auſtin*, *Epiſt.* 120. *cap.* 27. Where he tells us, 'That the Faithful came to the Table, 'they eat and Adored the ſame; he maintains in his *Comment.* 82. that place *Pſalm* xcviii. upon Worſhip his Foot-ſtool, where the *Foot-ſtool* he explains by the Earth, and the Earth by the Fleſh of Chriſt; 'Becauſe (*ſays* 'he) he walked here in our Fleſh, and gave 'his very Fleſh to be eaten by us for our 'Salvation; and no man eats that Fleſh, 'unleſs he hath firſt Adored it. It is diſcovered how ſuch a *Foot-ſtool* of our Lord may be Adored, and we ſhall not only not Sin in Adoring, but we Sin in not Adoring; and *St. Ambrge de Spiritu Sancto*, *l.* 13. *c.* 11. upon the ſame words, ſays thus: 'By the *Foot-* 'ſtool is meant the *Earth*, and by the *Earth*, 'the *Fleſh of Chriſt*, which we daily Adore 'in the Myſteries; Thus St. *Ambroſe*: The like hath St. *Chryſoſtom in Epiſt. ad Eph. homil.*

3. where he hath it thus; *Adore this and Eat*: And St. *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem*, *Catech.* 3. *Myſtagog* hath theſe words; 'Make thy ap-'proach to the Chalice of his Blood in the 'manner of Adoration. This the Church has conſtanty held from the beginning, and holds even to this day; as appears from the General *Council of Trent*, *Seſſ.* 13. *Cap.* 5. where it requires the Worſhip of *Latria* to be given to the *Sacrament*, according to the cuſtom ever received in the Church.

Many more *Teſtimonies* of the *Holy Fathers* are yet behind, which to produce were eaſy, if there were no pains in Tranſcribing them; and thoſe already produced are ſufficient for the truth of the *Euchariſt*, and for the *Real Preſence* of the *Body of Chriſt* there.

Jo. 6. *v.* 54. *Who Eates my Fleſh, and Drinks my Blood, hath Eternal Life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day.* And the *Council of Nice* calls the *Euchariſt Symbolum Reſurrectionis, a token of the Reſurrection*; and St. *Ignatius M. Epiſt.* 14. *ad Epeſ. termes it Pharmacum Immortalitatis*; A Medicine of Immortality.

Now if you ask the manner how it ſerves, as an incorruptible food for a Glorious Reſurrection.

I Anſwer, The Species being altered by the heat of the Stomach, the Body of Chriſt ceaſes to be here, but his Deity remains after a ſpecial manner in the Soul, (as the virtue of Wheat remains in the corrupted grain, to raiſe it again at Spring) feeding it

it with Grace, and at ſet times affording it new infuſions of Actual Grace, Divine Lights and Heavenly Affections; and in the Reſurrection raiſes again the Body, and unites it to the Soul.

Reformers Objects, that the ſame Body of Chriſt cannot be multiplied ſo often over. We anſwer out of *Gen.* 2. 21. *Our Lord God caſt a dead ſleep upon* Adam, *and when he was faſt aſleep, he took one of his Ribs, and filled up fleſh for it, and our Lord God built the Rib which he took of* Adam *into a Woman.* I ask how many times over muſt this Rib be multiplied, before a whole Woman (of a comely proper Stature) could be made of it: After the ſame manner, God can of one ordinary Brick make a Pillar of many Foot high, by Multiplying that one Brick; in the like manner, our Saviour Multiplied thoſe five Barley Loves with which he fed above five Thouſand Men. *Jo.* 6. For if he made new Loves, he did not feed them with thoſe five; but with thoſe many hundred new Loves which he made; and yet the *Scripture* ſaith *v.* 12. 13. *After they were filled, they gathered the Remnants, and filled Twelve Baskets with the fragments of the five Barley Loves*; and not of any new Loves created by Chriſt: So that the Bread which was eaten remained ſtill to be eaten; and it is worth our noting, that our Saviour did this Miracle, immediately before he did firſt declare this ſtrange Doctrine of giving his fleſh to be eaten like bread by

every one; that ſo, when he ſhould have no reaſon to disbelieve the poſſibility thereof: For his Diſciples ſeeing that he had done that Prodigious Miracle: So very lately, ought not preſently to have ſaid, *This is hard, and who can hear it?* Neither ought they ſo ſoon to have walked a-part from him, as there St. *John* ſaith, 'They did; but rather 'they ought to have ſaid with St. *Peter*, We 'believe and know thou art the Son of God, 'able to make thy words good, as thou wert 'able ſo to multiply ſo few Loaves.

Concerning the Expoſition of theſe words,

THIS IS MY BODY.

WE ſay theſe words, *This is my Body*, prove clearly the *Real Preſence* of Chriſt's Body in the *Hoſt*. Becauſe they ought to be taken in their proper ſenſe, in which they would prove it clearly by the grant of our adverſaries, who therefore ſay, they are to be taken *Figuratively*. Now that they ought to be taken here in their proper ſenſe, I prove 1. poſitively.

Poſitive Proofs.

1. WHen in a Speech a word is indifferent of it ſelf, to be taken in the literal or figurative ſenſe, you muſt look to the words that follow in the ſame Speech; if they expreſs the property of a figure, the word is to be taken figuratively; if the property of the real thing, then the word is to be taken in the literal ſenſe.

For Example, when one tells me *I have ſeen the King*, I know not yet what he means; whether his perſon or picture; but when he

adds, *ſet in a frame of Gold*, I know he means his Picture, becauſe 'tis the property of a Picture to be ſet in a Frame. If he adds, *ſpeaking with the Chancellour*, I know he means the King's Perſon, becauſe 'tis the property of a perſon to ſpeak with another. Juſt ſo, when Chriſt ſays, *Luke 22. v. 19. This is my Body*: I know not yet what he means, whether his Real Body, or only a figure of it. But when he adds, *which is given for you*, I know he means of his true Body, becauſe 'tis the property of a true body to be ſacrificed for us.

2. I prove again, that theſe words of Chriſt, *This is my Body*, are to be taken in the literal ſenſe, by the Proteſtant Principle, which is this. When two paſſages relate to, or ſpeak of the ſame matter in Scripture, the obſcurer paſſage is to be explained by the clearer.

But theſe two paſſages relating to our Lord's Supper, *This is my Body*; and, *Do this in remembrance of me*; This latter is the obſcurer, and that former the clearer; then this latter ought to be explained by that former, that is to ſay, to the ſenſe of that former, *viz.* Chriſt having changed a piece of bread into his Body by his Almighty word, ſays there to his Diſciples, *Do ye for the food of other Souls, what ye have ſeen me do for the food of yours*: Change ye likewiſe, by pronouncing the words I have ordained for that end, bread into my Body: but do

it

it with ſuch circumſtances that people ſtanding by may be mindful of my death and paſſion.

But the clear Propoſition ought not to be explained by the obſcure one, thus: *This is my Body*, that is to ſay, this is a figure only or a remembrance of my body, becauſe he ſaid after *do this in remembrance of me*; for the thing was now done, and he told them what it was in clear words, afore he ſaid, *Do this in remembrance of me*; He did not ſay, *this is a remembrance of me*; no, but *Do this in remembrance of me*; He did not ſpeak of the ſubſtance of the thing, but only of the manner of doinglit. By theſe words then *in remembrance of me*, he only intimated, that they ſhould make at that ſame time a ſenſible expreſſion of his paſſion to the people, as is ſeen done in the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*. If by, *This*, he underſtood a figure or remembrance, then he had ſaid, do or make a remembrance of me in remembrance of me, or remember me to remember me, which is ridiculous.

Now, let any indifferent and judicious man be judge, if theſe words *do this in remembrance of me*, be as clear to prove, that in the *Euchariſt* or the Lord's Supper is only a Figure of Chriſt's Body; as theſe words *This is my Body*, are clear to prove, that the *Euchariſt* is his true Body.

If you inſtance, that as Chriſt ſaid, *This is my Body*, ſo he ſaid alſo *I am a Vine*, and conſequently, as the latter Propoſition muſt be

be taken figuratively, ſo muſt alſo the former. *I anſwer*, it doth not follow, there being a great diſparity. For we all, *Proteſtants* as well as *Catholicks*, avow that Propoſitions in the Holy Scripture cannot be taken in the literal ſenſe, if ſo taken, they imply or intimate ſomething contrary to Faith, as this Propoſition *I am a Vine* literally taken would do. For *Proteſtants* as well as *Catholicks* believe that the *Divine Word* hath aſſumed no nature but that of Man; then he hath not aſſumed that of a Vine, and conſequently 'tis againſt Faith to ſay in the literal ſenſe, *Chriſt is a Vine.*

But theſe words *This is my Body*, taken in the literal ſenſe, imply nothing againſt Faith; no more than he, who ſhewing you a knife, ſays, *This is a Knife*; for the term *This*, and the term *Knife*, ſuppoſe for the ſame thing, and not for different natures; ſo in Chriſt's Propoſition, *This is my Body*, *This*, and *Body*, ſuppoſe for the ſame thing, not *This* for *Bread*, but for *The Body of Chriſt*; as well as the word *Body* ſuppoſes for it; though in a different way of ſignifying, *This* obſcurely, and *Body* clearly and diſtinctly.

Here I humbly intreat the *Proteſtant* Reader to reflect, that in the myſteries of Religion we muſt captivate our underſtanding, 2 *Cor.* 10. 5. (that is to ſay; ſuſpend it from aſſerting what it might judge, had he nothing to rely upon, but the ſole relation of our ſenſes) to obey Chriſt.

God

God will have, as an homage due to him and his veracity, this proud faculty of man, which is earneſt to judge of all, ſubmit to his word. The aſſent of my underſtanding, by which I judge a thing to be, becauſe I ſee it with my eyes, is an aſſent of ſcience, which is a knowledge quite different from the aſſent of Faith. In the mean time, we Chriſtians, as Chriſtians are called, not Philoſophers the Reaſoners, but the Faithful. *Fides eſt*, as we ſay, *credere quod non vides, Faith is to believe that which thou doſt not ſee. This is the praiſe of Faith*, ſaith St. Aug. tract. 29. in Io. *If that, which is believed, be not ſeen. Bleſſed are they, ſaid Chriſt* Jo. 20. *v.* 29. *who have not ſeen and have believed. Faith is an argument, (or perſuaſion) ſaith St.* Paul, *of things not appearing.* If they appear, and I aſſent that they are, becauſe I ſee them, my Faith ceaſes, Science coming in with Faith's Deſtruction.

If you ſay, I belive that the Son of God became Man, becauſe God hath revealed it, and my ſenſes do not controul it; your Faith is lame, and not able to ſtand alone, and conſequently is an unworthy Sacrifice of your underſtanding to the word of God.

What would the King ſay to that Noble man, who ſhould diſtruſt his relation made in preſence of all his Courtiers, of a thing done by his Majeſty upon his Royal word; who ſhould (I ſay) diſtruſt it, becauſe he

the

heard it controuled by a Foot-boy, or ſome ſuch mean perſon of as little credit?

As humane Faith requires, I rely upon the ſole teſtimony of a man, ſo does divine Faith require I rely upon the ſole Teſtimony of God; ſhall I truſt the word of a man ſometimes contrary to ſenſible appearance, as when I truſt upon the word of a Doctor or a Chirurgion, that that which I feel hurts me, will do me good, and ſhall not I truſt the Word of God, becauſe my Senſes ſeem to controul it?

But be not miſtaken, neither ſenſe nor reaſon controuls the *Real Preſence* of Chriſt's Body in the *Euchariſt*. For, ſenſe after the Conſecration, finds its whole Object, Colour, Taſte, *&c.* Juſt as before the Conſecration unchanged, and meddles not to judge whether the Body of Chriſt, or the ſubſtance of Bread, be under the Accidents, as a thing belonging to the underſtanding, and not within the compaſs of its Object. And Reaſon tells us, that although all the accidents of a ſubſtance be preſent, nevertheleſs their ſubſtance is not there, if the Author of nature has not revealed that he hinders its preſence to them; and therefore does not controul our ſaying, that the ſubſtance of Bread is not in the *Euchariſt* after the Conſecration, becauſe the Author of Nature hath revealed the contrary. No more then it controuls *Proteſtants*, ſaying, that thoſe three, who appeared to *Abraham Geneſ.* 18. with all the

ac-

accidents of Men, were not Men but Angels, becauſe God has revealed it was ſo.

3. Chriſt by his Almighty Power, could change Bread into his fleſh; and he tells us *Matth.* 26. in theſe words, *This is my Body*, that he hath done it; why ſhall not I believe it? O but it ſeems ſtrange to our apprehenſion! muſt God then in that thing in which he will make to all men a memorial of his wonders, *Pſal.* 110. *v.* 4. do nothing but what is within the reach of meaner wits, and falls under their ſenſes? this claim is too proud therefore in humility.

Here I may ſay with S. *Aug.* Lib. 22. de Civit. Dei. Cap. 11. *Ecce qualibus argumentis omnipotentiæ Dei humana contradicit infirmitas quam poſſidet vanitas. Behold with what arguments human Infirmity poſſeſſed with vanity, oppoſes the almighty power of God.*

FINIS.